UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
AT LOS ANGELES



THE GIFT OF
MAY TREAT MORRISON
IN MEMORY OF
ALEXANDER F MORRISON

THE REFORMATION

THE REFORMATION

BY

GEORGE PARK FISHER, D.D., LL.D.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
IN YALE UNIVERSITY

NEW AND REVISED EDITION

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1906

Copyright, 1873,
By SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG, AND COMPANY.
Copyright, 1906,
By CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.



BR
305
F53 H
1906

DEDICATION OF THE FIRST EDITION:

TO

THEODORE DWIGHT WOOLSEY

A FRIEND AND EXAMPLE OF ALL GOOD LEARNING

THIS WORK IS INSCRIBED

AS A TOKEN OF RESPECT AND AFFECTION

BY THE AUTHOR

IN THIS NEW EDITION

THE AUTHOR WOULD COUPLE WITH THE NAME OF WOOLSEY

THAT OF ANOTHER RIPE SCHOLAR AND DEAR FRIEND

THE LATE

EPHRAIM WHITMAN GURNEY

THEN PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY

WHO LENT HIS AID IN THE REVISAL OF

THE PROOF SHEETS OF THE

FIRST EDITION

GIFT OF MRS. A. F. MORRISON MAR 27 '43

432005

PREFACE

This work had its origin in a course of lectures which were given at the Lowell Institute early in the spring of 1871. When I engaged to prepare those lectures, the subject was not new to me; and the interval prior to the issue of them was devoted to studies in the same field, the results of which were incorporated in the volume. It has appeared to me practicable to present to intelligent and educated readers, within the compass of the present volume, the means of acquainting themselves with the origin and nature, the principal facts and characters, of the Reformation; while at the same time, through notes and references, the historical student should be guided to further researches on the various topics which are brought under his notice. There are two features in the plan of the present work to which it may not be unseemly to call attention. With the religious and theological side of the history of the period, I have endeavored to interweave and to set in their true relation the political, secular, and more general elements, which had so powerful an influence in determining the course of events. The attempt has also been made to elucidate briefly, but sufficiently, points pertaining to the history of theological doctrine, an understanding of which is peculiarly essential in the study of this period of history.

The authorities on which I have chiefly depended are indicated in the marginal references. The first place belongs to the writings, and especially to the correspondence, of the Reformers themselves. The letters of Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin; the correspondence of the English with the Helvetic Reformers during the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth; the correspondence of Reformers in the French-speaking lands, in the collection of M. Herminjard, afford the most vivid as well as correct impression of the transactions in which their authors bore a leading part. Works like the

"Correspondence of Philip II.," which M. Gachard — among his other valuable contributions — has published from the archives of Simancas, have cast much new light on another side of the history of this era. Of the more recent historians, there are two of whom I am prompted to make special mention in this place. The first is Ranke, whose admirable series of works on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have been constantly in my hands. The mingling of general views with apposite and characteristic facts, lent to the historical productions of this truly illustrious writer a peculiar charm. The other historian is Gieseler, who possessed in an eminent degree the genius for accuracy, which Gibbon ascribed to Tillemont, and whose investigations, though extensive and profound upon every period of Church History, are nowhere more instructive than upon the period of the Reformation. It must be a matter of sincere regret to all scholars that Neander did not live to carry forward his great work, the counterpart of Gieseler, into this period. His posthumous History of Doctrine is quite brief in its treatment of the Protestant movement, but is not wanting in striking suggestions. Perhaps I should add to this short catalogue, the "Histoire de France" of Henri Martin, which appears to me to be one of the most satisfactory of the comprehensive works on the history of that country.

The advantages received by a historical student from the writings of others, he may be so fairly conscious of as to be able to enumerate them. But one's obligation to the quickening influence and the scholarly talents of the associates with whom he is personally conversant are not subject to so facile a reckoning. In such a relation one may be aware, in some cases, of an unpayable indebtedness. It is the privilege of the present writer to acknowledge the debt which he owes to friends of this class whose intimacy he has been permitted to prize.

There is one explanation further which I am anxious to make respecting the design of this book. It is intended in no sense as a polemical work. It has not entered into my thoughts to inculcate the creed of Protestantism, or to propagate any type of Christian doctrine; much less to kindle animosity against the Church of Rome. Very serious as the points of difference are which separate the body of Protestants from the body of

Roman Catholics, the points on which they agree outweigh in importance the points on which they differ. Whoever supposes that the Reformers were exempt from grave faults and infirmities, must either be ignorant of their history, or have studied it under the influence of a partisan bias. Impartiality, however, is not indifference; and a frigid and carping spirit, that chills the natural outflow of a just admiration, may, equally with the spirit of hero-worship, hinder one from arriving at the real truth, as well as the best lessons of history.

Should this volume be used in the class-room, it may be suggested to teachers that frequent reference should be made to the Chronological Table in the Appendix, where contemporaneous events in the different countries are grouped together. Dates are frequently set down in the text, but are given more fully in the Table of Contents. In the List of Works, which follows the Chronological Table, some of the books to which the more advanced student would naturally resort are briefly characterized.

In two or three places only, in this volume, the term "consubstantiation" is applied to the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist; but the term is defined (p. 129) as the co-presence of two substances, — a sense in which it is allowed by the best Lutheran theologians. The attentive reader of the last chapter will observe that the effects which are there ascribed to the Reformation, are not ascribed to the dogmatic system of Protestantism exclusively, but to the Protestant religion, taken comprehensively. It is the genius and spirit of Protestantism, as seen in the long processes of history, which are there referred to. The place and the importance of the Renaissance are illustrated in various parts of the volume, especially in the third chapter. The influence of the Renaissance on modern culture is not undervalued in this work; nor is the Renaissance confounded with the religious Reform. There is one other point which may deserve a word of remark. The Church of the Middle Ages is not considered "a mitigated evil," but an incalculable benefit to society. What is said of the Papacy should not be understood of the Church, — the organized, collective influence of Christianity. But even the Papacy, as is shown, was, in the mediæval period, in many particulars, a beneficent institution.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE REFORMATION

	PAGE
Four principal events of modern history	1
Long historical preparation of these events	1
Agency of individuals not to be undervalued	2
Theories in respect to the Reformation	2
An astrological hypothesis	2
Theory that it was a quarrel of monastic orders	3
That it was an academical dispute	4
That it was a new phase of the old conflict of Popes and Emperors	4
That it was an insurrection against authority: (advanced by Guizot).	4
That it was a transitional step towards Rationalism	5
Protestantism alleged to foster infidelity	6
Its fundamental characteristic	7
The Reformation primarily a religious event	7
Judaizing character of mediæval Christianity: constant reaction of the spiritual element	7
Protestantism positive as well as negative	8
It has an objective factor	8
It practically asserted the right of private judgment	8
It was a part of the general progress of society	9
General characteristics of the entire period	9
Two-fold aspect of the Reformation — religious, and political or secular	10
Chronological limits of the era	10

CHAPTER II

THE RISE OF THE PAPAL HIERARCHY AND ITS DECLINE THROUGH THE CENTRALIZATION OF NATIONS

Protestantism rejected priestly authority	11
The relation of sacerdotal authority to Papal supremacy	11
The new Dispensation spiritual, in contrast with the old	12
Absence of a mediatorial priesthood	12
Officers of the primitive Church	12
Functions of a priesthood gradually associated with the ministry	13
Growth of a hierarchy	14
Irenæus and Tertullian make the Church the door of access to Christ (circa 200)	14

PAGE

Causes of the precedence of the See of Rome 15
Acknowledged in the East, because Rome is the capital; claimed in the West on account of Peter 17
Accession of Constantine (311); Church not merged in the State, and why 17
Power of the Emperors over the Church 17
Decline of the Empire increases the authority of the Roman bishop 17
Leo, the Great (440–461) 17
The Papacy exalted, yet endangered, by the fall of the Western Empire (476) 18
Spread of Arianism and Mohammedanism 18
Fortunate alliance of the Papacy with the Franks (750) . . . 18
Rescue of the Papacy by Pepin and Charlemagne 19
Significance of the coronation of Charlemagne (800) 19
Effect of the fall of his Empire on the Papacy 20
The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (circa 850). 20
Enforced by Nicholas I. (858–867) 20
Anarchy in Italy: the period of pornocracy: intervention of Henry III. (1046) 21
Hildebrand (1073–1085) and his reforming plan: theory of the Papacy and the Empire: their inevitable conflict 21
Advantages of the Papacy in this conflict 22
Victory of the Popes; Henry IV., the Worms Concordat (1122); Alexander III. (1177) 23
Culmination of Papal power; Innocent III. (1198–1216) . . . 24
His theory of the Papal office 24
His exercise of authority 25
Rise of the spirit of nationalism; its various manifestations . . 26
Benefits of the Papacy in the Middle Ages; approach of another era 26
National languages and literatures 27
Anti-hierarchical spirit of the vernacular writers 27
The same spirit in the Legists 30
Reaction against the Papacy; Boniface VIII. (1294–1303) . . 30
Conflict of Boniface with Philip the Fair 31
Declining prestige of the Papacy; the Babylonian captivity (1309–1377) 32
Character of the Papacy at Avignon; Petrarch's testimony . . 32
Opposition from Germany and England 32
The Monarchists against the Papists 33
Attacks upon Papal usurpations by writers; Marsilius of Padua and William of Occam 33
The Gallican or constitutional theory; the Reforming Councils (1409–1443) 35
Increasing sway of national and secular, in the room of ecclesiastical feelings, in the fifteenth century 36
Consolidation of monarchies; England, France, Spain . . . 36
Secular and worldly character of the Popes 37
Sixtus IV. (1471–84); Innocent VIII. (1484–92); Alexander VI. (1492–1503); Julius II. (1503–13) 37
Character of Leo X. (1513–21); judgment of Sarpi, Pallavicini, Muratori, Guicciardini 38
The importance of the Popes, chiefly political 39
The concessions to them from Princes more apparent than real . . 40

PAGE
An illustration in the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction (1516) . . 40
Domination of secular and political interests, seen in the contests of Charles V. and Francis I. 41
The development of nationalism and the secularizing of the Papacy, at the beginning of the sixteenth century 41

CHAPTER III

SPECIAL CAUSES AND OMENS OF AN ECCLESIASTICAL REVOLUTION PRIOR TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

Mediæval Christianity characterized by legalism 43
Forms of reaction against it: dissent from dogmas; attacks on the usurpations and abuses of the clergy; opposition to the excessive esteem of ceremonies and austerities 44
Consequences of a possible increase of intelligence 44
Two classes of forerunners of the Reformation 44
Anti-sacerdotal sects 45
The Catharists (Albigenses) 45
The Waldenses; their origin (1170) 46
The Franciscan Spirituals; the Fratricelli 47
The Beguines and Beghards 47
What is indicated by the rise of these sects 48
The conservative or Gallican Reformers 48
Radical Reformers; John Wickliffe (1324–1384) and his opinions . 49
How he was protected 50
The Lollards 50
John Huss (1373–1415); his predecessors; Matthias of Janow . . 50
The character and principles of Huss 51
Huss and Wickliffe on the authority of prelates and magistrates . 51
John Wessel (1420–89); Luther's opinion of him 52
Savonarola (1452–98) 53
The Mystics; character of Mysticism 54
Mysticism among the Schoolmen; Bernard, Bonaventura . . . 54
John Tauler (1290–1361); the "German Theology" 54
The "Imitation of Christ" 55
Nicholas of Cues 56
The Revival of Learning; begins in Italy, Dante (1265–1321); Petrarch (1304–74); Boccaccio (1313–75) 57
Spread of the literary spirit; consequences to the Church . . . 59
Benefits and faults of Scholasticism; causes of its downfall . . 59
It had lost its vitality; effect of Nominalism 60
Renewed study of the Fathers and of the Scriptures 61
Sceptical spirit of Humanism in Italy; influence of the classic school on the Church of Italy 61
Semi-pagan tone of politics and ethics; Macchiavelli (1469–1527) . 63
Religious tone of Humanism in Germany; Reuchlin (1455–1522) . 63
His victory over the Monks 64
Humanism and the Universities; Wittenberg (1502) 64
Humanism in England; Colet, Erasmus, More 64
The "Utopia"; its liberal ideas on Religion 65
Erasmus (1467–1536) the leader of Humanism 66
His fame and acquirements 66

PAGE

His "Praise of Folly" 67
His chastisement of ecclesiastical follies and abuses 68
His editions of the Fathers and of the New Testament . . . 69
Diffusion of his writings 69
What may be inferred from their character and popularity . . 70
Recapitulation; symptoms of the rise of a new order of things . . 70

CHAPTER IV

LUTHER AND THE GERMAN REFORMATION TO THE DIET OF AUGSBURG, 1530

Protestantism congenial to the German mind 72
Luther the hero of the Reformation 73
His birth (1483) and parentage 74
Studies at Erfurt (1501–5); enters a convent (1505) 75
Made a Professor at Wittenberg (1508) 77
His literary and theological attainments 77
His religious experience 78
Sees that justification is by faith 78
Origin of indulgences; the Scholastic doctrine 79
Luther opposes the sale of indulgences by Tetzel (1516) . . . 80
Luther posts his ninety-five Theses (1517); their contents . . . 81
Their effect in Germany 83
Attacks and replies; he meets Cajetan at Augsburg (1518) . . 83
Accedes to the truce offered by Miltitz (1519) 84
The Leipsic Disputation (1519); Philip Melancthon 84
Melancthon's character; Luther's geniality and humor . . . 85
He asserts that the primacy of the Pope is *jure humano* . . . 86
Effect of the Leipsic Disputation upon his studies and opinions . . 86
He appeals to the laity; Address to the Nobles (1520) . . . 86
Writes "the Babylonian Captivity of the Church" (1520) . . . 87
Writes on the "Freedom of a Christian Man" (1520) 88
Is excommunicated; burns the Papal bull (1520) 88
Commotion produced in Germany; he finds political, religious, and literary allies 89
Ulrich von Hutten (1488–1523) 89
Political condition of Germany; weakness of the central government 90
Abortive efforts under Maximilian (1493–1519) to organize the Empire 90
Discontent and disorder; complaints by the knights, the cities, the peasantry 91
The election of Charles V. (1519): consequent alarm in Europe . 91
Rivalship of Charles V. and Francis I. (1515–1547); its grounds, the strength of the rivals respectively 91
Character of Charles V.: his conduct in the affair of the Reformation 93
Luther summoned to the Diet of Worms (1521); his journey . . 94
Appears before the Diet; refuses to recant 95
Placed under the ban of the Empire 97
Alliance of the Emperor with Leo X.; the terms of it . . . 98
Luther at the Wartburg (1521–22) 98
His occupations; labors on the translation of the New Testament . 99
Radical movement of Carlstadt: Luther returns to Wittenberg (1522) 100

PAGE
He restores order; his vast labors 101
The Council of Regency declines to suppress Lutheranism . . . 101
The character of Pope Adrian VI. (1522–23) and Pope Clement VII. (1523–34) 101
The Diet at Nuremberg (1524); remands the subject of the Worms decree to the several princes 102
Union of Catholic princes and bishops; division of the Nation . . 102
Protestant League of Torgau (1526) 103
Battle of Pavia (1525); confederacy against Charles 103
The Diet of Spires (1526) refuses to enforce the Worms Edict . . 103
Sack of Rome and triumph of the Emperor (1527) 103
Repressive action of the Diet of Spires (1529); the Protest . . 104
Opposition of Luther to armed resistance 104
The Diet of Augsburg (1530); situation and spirit of Charles . . 104
The Augsburg Confession and Apology 105
Decree adverse to the Protestants 105
The courage and fidelity of the Elector John 105
Luther at Coburg (1530); his correspondence 106
His marriage to Catharine von Bora (1525) 108
His motives; effect of his example 108
His controversy with King Henry VIII. (1522) 109
The intemperance of Luther's language, how explained . . . 109
His apologetic letter to Henry VIII. (1525) 111
The position of Erasmus in relation to the Lutheran movement . 112
His gradual estrangement from Luther and his cause . . . 113
Merits of the controversy 115
Inability of Humanism to effect a Reform 115
The peasants' war (1525); how far owing to Protestantism . . 116
Luther supports the princes 117

CHAPTER V

THE GERMAN REFORMATION TO THE PEACE OF AUGSBURG; ZWINGLI AND THE SWISS (GERMAN) REFORMATION

The character of the Swiss; they serve as mercenaries in the armies of France and of the Pope 119
Birth of Zwingli (1484); his native character; his education . . 120
At Glarus (1506–16) he opposes the system of pensions and of hired service under the French 120
At Einsiedeln (1516–18) preaches salvation by the grace of Christ alone 121
Adopts the principle of the exclusive authority of the Bible . . 122
Preaches against indulgences; is established at Zurich (1519) . . 122
His qualities as a man and a preacher 123
Public disputation (1523); the council of the city sustains him . . 123
His doctrines; a second disputation 124
Zurich becomes a separate Protestant Church (1524) 124
Zwingli's "Commentary on True and False Religion" (1525) . . 124
His view respecting the salvation of the heathen 124
The Reformation in Basel (1529); Berne (1528); St. Gall (1528); Schaffhausen (1529) 125

PAGE

The ecclesiastical revolution is also a political one 125
Contrast of Luther and Zwingli; their religious experience . . 126
Comparative conservatism of Luther 126
Mingling of patriotism and religion in Zwingli 127
Luther led the resistance to the Church of Rome 128
The Eucharistic controversy between the Lutherans and the Swiss 129
History of the doctrine of the Eucharist 129
Three opinions; Luther, Zwingli, Calvin 129
Ground of Luther's vehemence against the Zwinglian doctrine . . 130
The Conference at Marburg (1529) 132
The result; subsequent revival of the controversy (1543) . . . 134
Catastrophe of the Swiss Reformation; war between the Catholic and Protestant Cantons 134
Death of Zwingli (1531) 135
The Treaty of Peace; Protestantism checked 136
Formation of the League of Smalcald (1531) 136
The Emperor disabled for ten years (1532–42) from carrying out the Augsburg Decree 137
Catholic League (1538) 137
Conferences of the opposing parties (1537–45); Contarini . . . 138
The League of Smalcald, how weakened 139
Maurice of Saxony joins the Emperor (1546) 139
Last days of Luther 139
The relations of Luther and Melancthon to each other . . . 140
Melancthon's funeral address on Luther (1546) 142
Luther's power and influence; remarks of Döllinger 142
The Smalcaldic war (1546–47); defeat of the Protestants at Mühlberg (1547) 143
The Augsburg Interim (1548); Charles's plan of pacification . . 143
He is disappointed; action of the Council of Trent 143
Union of Paul III. and Francis I. against him (1547). 144
Resistance to the Augsburg Interim in North Germany; the Leipsic Interim (1548) 144
Better prospects of Protestantism 145
Maurice turns against Charles; drives him out of Innsbruck (1552) 145
Treaty of Passau (1552) 146
Peace of Augsburg (1555); the *jus reformandi:* the Ecclesiastical Reservation 146
Abdication of Charles (1556) 147

CHAPTER VI

THE REFORMATION IN THE SCANDINAVIAN KINGDOMS, IN THE SLAVONIC NATIONS, AND IN HUNGARY

Spread of the Reformation; agency of Germans; influence of Wittenberg 148
The Scandinavian kingdoms; the Union of Calmar (1397) . . . 148
Christian II. of Denmark (1513–23) favors Protestantism, then draws back 148
He is deposed and succeeded by Frederic I. (1523–33) . . . 149
Spread of Lutheranism in Denmark in his reign 149

PAGE
Under Christian III. the Reformation is legalized 150
Constitution of the Danish Protestant Church 150
Democratic movements in Lübeck and other cities, in connection with the Reformation 151
Establishment of Protestantism in Norway (1537) 152
Olaf and Laurence Petersen preach Protestantism in Sweden (1519) . 153
Gustavus Vasa (1523–60) favors it 153
It is adopted at the Diet of Westeras (1527) 153
What was done with ecclesiastical property 153
Failure of subsequent efforts to restore Catholicism 154
Effect of the execution of Huss in Bohemia (1415) 154
Hussite movement was both religious and national 155
The demand of the cup for the laity; history of the practice of withholding it 155
The Prague University declares for the Utraquists 155
Division of the Utraquists; the Taborites 155
Ziska (1360–1424) their leader 156
The Articles of Prague, the platform of the Utraquists (1421) . . 156
Three Crusades fail to subdue them 157
They are heard at the Council of Basel (1433) 157
The Compactata 158
Conflict of Calixtines and Taborites 158
The rise of the Brethren in Unity (circa 1450) 158
Favorable reception of Lutheranism by the Hussites 158
The Utraquists refuse to join Ferdinand in the Smalcaldic war . . 159
Subsequent persecution of Bohemian Protestants 159
Religious condition of Poland at the time of the Reformation . . 159
How Protestantism was introduced 160
The spread of the new doctrine in Polish Prussia and in Livonia (1524) 160
Sigismund II. (1548–72) favorable to it 161
Religious dissension among Protestants: spread of Unitarianism . 161
John à Lasco (1499–1560) 162
Union of Lutherans, Calvinists, and Brethren, in the Synod of Sendomir (1570) 162
Equality of rights granted to all the Churches 162
The Reformation introduced into Hungary 163
Effect of the civil war (1526) upon its progress 163
Strife between the Calvinists and Lutherans 164

CHAPTER VII

JOHN CALVIN AND THE GENEVAN REFORMATION

Calvin belongs to the second generation of Reformers . . . 166
His birth (1509), family, and education 166
Studies at Paris; studies law at Orleans and Bourges . . . 167
His mental power and habits of study 167
Publishes Seneca's treatise on "Clemency" (1532); his motive . . 168
His conversion (1532) 169
His reserve and love of retirement 169
Obliged to fly from Paris (1533); at Angoulême; at Béarn; returns to Paris 172

PAGE
Obliged again to fly, on account of placards against the mass (1535) . 173
His first theological work; the "Psychopannychia" (1534) . . 173
At Basel (1535); studies Hebrew; writes the "Institutes" . . 173
His motive in composing this work 173
His characteristics as a writer and a man 174
His adoption of the Bible as the sole standard of doctrine . . . 175
His conception of the Church and reverence for it 175
His doctrine of predestination 176
Is attached to the doctrine on practical grounds 176
His opinion compared with that of Augustine 177
His ability as a commentator 178
Not an extremist in respect to forms and rites 178
The acerbity of his temper 179
His piety tinged with the Old Testament spirit 179
His homage to law and sense of the exaltation of God . . . 179
Less broad in his sympathies than Luther 180
His greatness of mind and of character 181
Visits the court of the Duchess of Ferrara (1536) 181
Stops at Geneva on his return (1536) 181
Geneva subject to Savoy; achieves its independence (1533) . . 182
Protestant influences from Berne 182
Expulsion of the Bishop from Geneva and establishment of Protestantism (1535) 183
Farel (1489–1565); his history and character; his preaching at Geneva 183
Discontent there with the new ecclesiastical system 184
State of morals 184
Farel moves Calvin to remain and assist him (1536) 184
Strict regulations of Church discipline 185
Opposition to them 185
The preachers refuse to administer the Sacrament 186
They are banished by the citizens (1538) 186
Calvin resides at Strasburg; attends the German religious Conferences (1539–1541) 187
His opinion of Luther; his relations to Melancthon 187
His marriage 188
Is recalled to Geneva (1541), and why 188
His letter to Sadolet 189
His reluctance to return 189
The Genevan civil and ecclesiastical system 190
The Little Council; the Consistory 190
Vigilant supervision of the people by preachers and elders . . . 190
The Venerable Company 191
Calvin takes part in framing the civil laws 191
How the preachers were chosen 191
Disaffection arises; the Libertines 192
Combination of different classes of Calvin's opponents . . . 192
Severity of the Genevan laws 193
Religious intolerance; its history 193
Practiced in the Middle Ages 194
The Reformers did not advocate toleration 195
Conflicts of Calvin and efforts to intimidate him 196
Bolsec banished (1551) for assailing the doctrine of predestination 196

PAGE
Expulsion of Castellio (1544) 196
Michael Servetus; his history and character 197
His book on the "Errors of the Trinity" (1531) 197
His second book — the "Restoration of Christianity" . . . 198
Tried for heresy before a Roman Catholic Court at Vienne . . 198
Proof furnished from Geneva 198
He escapes and comes to Geneva (1553) 199
Is arrested and tried 199
Is convicted and burned at the stake 200
Agency of Calvin in the transaction; verdict of Guizot . . . 200
The execution of Servetus generally approved 202
Further efforts of the Libertines; their final overthrow (1555) . . 202
Calvin's multiplied labors and vast influence 203
His last years; the variety of his employments; his infirmities of body 204
His last illness (1564); his interview with the Council . . . 205
His interview with the preachers 205
Estimate of his character 206
Calvinism lays emphasis on the sovereignty of God 207
Why favorable to civil liberty 207
It does not surrender the government of the Church to the civil authority 207
Its church organization is republican 208
It dwarfs earthly sovereignty by exalting the divine 208
Compared with Romanism in its view of the civil authority . . 208

CHAPTER VIII

THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE

The Sorbonne and Parliament oppose doctrinal innovations . . 209
Effect of the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction (1516) . . . 209
Reform emanates from Humanism 209
Francis I. (1515–47); the patron of learning and art 209
Lefèvre (1450–1536), the Father of the Reformation; his studies and writings 210
His mystical turn; his pupil, Briçonnet 211
Hostility of the Sorbonne and of Parliament to Lefèvre and his school 211
Heresy suppressed in Meaux (1525) 211
Margaret, Queen of Navarre (1492–1549); her sympathy with the Mystical School 212
Her writings; she favors the Protestants without joining them . . 212
Francis I. opposes the Sorbonne; supports his sister 213
Changes his course; engages in persecution 214
Doubtful position of France respecting the Reformation . . . 214
Rome, Renaissance, the Reformation; the three rivals . . . 215
Why Calvinism was disliked 215
Spirit of Loyola and the Catholic Reaction 216
Rabelais (1483–1553) 216
Vacillation of Francis I. and its consequences 217
He persecutes the Protestants (1534); courts the alliance of the Lutheran princes 217
Spread of Protestantism in France in his reign 219

PAGE
Influence of Geneva and of Calvin 219
Henry II. (1547–59); his hostility to the Reformation . . . 219
Its progress 219
The Calvinists hold a general Synod (1559) 220
Persecution after the treaty of Cateau-Cambresis; death of Henry II. (1559) 220
Heroism of the sufferers 221
How the Huguenots became a political party 221
Catharine de Medici; her relations to Henry and his mistress; and her character 221
Francis II. (1559–60) is controlled by the Guises; their history and character 221
Discontent of the Bourbons and Chatillons 223
Connection of the great nobles with the Calvinists 223
Calvin preaches to them submission; their patience 224
The conspiracy of Amboise (1560) 225
Its consequences; the Edict of Romorantin (1560) 225
Coligny supports the petition of the Protestants for liberty of worship 225
The States General called together at Orléans (1560) 226
Arrest of Condé; Navarre placed under surveillance 226
Plot for the extirpation of Protestantism 226
Frustrated by the death of Francis II. (1560) 227
Catharine de Medici; her virtual guardianship of Charles IX. (1560–74), and regency 227
Influence of L'Hospital 227
Strength of the Protestants 227
Guise, Montmorenci, and St. André form the Triumvirate . . . 228
The Colloquy at Poissy (1561); Beza 228
The Edict of St. Germain (1562) grants a measure of toleration . 229
The Massacre of Vassy (1562) begins the civil wars 230
The Huguenots fought in self-defense 231
Siege of Rouen; battle of Dreux (1562); assassination of Guise (1563) 232
The Edict of Amboise (1563); the character of it 232
The Huguenots take up arms; Peace of Longjumeau (1568) . . 232
Conference at Bayonne (1565) 233
Renewal of the war under Spanish influence; battles of Jarnac and Moncontour (1569) 233
Treaty of St. Germain (1570); reasons that influenced the Court to make peace; fortified towns placed in the hands of the Huguenots 234
Political crisis in Europe; will France make war on Spain? . . 234
Proposal that Henry of Navarre shall marry Margaret of Valois . 235
Coligny comes to Court; his character 235
The origin of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew (1572) . . . 236
Had it been planned earlier? 237
Joy at Madrid and at Rome 238
Effect of the massacre on the surviving Huguenots 238
The party of the Politiques or Liberal Catholics is formed . . . 239
Organization of the League 239
Position of Henry III. (1574–89) 239
Excommunication of Navarre and Condé by Sixtus V. (1585) . . 240
War of the "Three Henries" (1586) 240
Assassination of the Guises by order of Henry III. (1588) . . . 240

PAGE
He joins the army of Henry of Navarre 240
Henry III. is assassinated (1589) 240
Henry IV.; his war with the League; the battle of Ivry (1590) . 240
His contest with Alexander of Parma (1592) 241
Abjuration of Henry IV.; its motives (1593); its effect . . . 241
Character of this act 241
Other misfortunes of the Huguenots 243
The administration of Henry IV.; the Edict of Nantes (1598) . . 243
The Huguenots become an isolated and defensive party . . . 244

CHAPTER IX

THE REFORMATION IN THE NETHERLANDS

Prosperity and intelligence of the people of the Netherlands . . 245
Relation of the Netherlands to the German Empire 246
Influences favorable to Protestantism 246
Persecuting edicts of Charles V. (1521 seq.) 246
Martyrdoms at Brussels (1523); Luther's hymn 247
Continued persecution by Charles V.; number of martyrs . . . 247
Abdication of Charles V. (1555) 248
Fanatical and despotic character of Philip II. (1555–98) . . . 248
His unpopularity in the Netherlands 249
The great nobles; Orange, Egmont 249
Margaret of Parma is made Regent (1559); her character . . . 250
Granvelle; his character 250
Conduct of the government is placed in his hands 250
Philip keeps in the Netherlands Spanish regiments 250
He creates new bishoprics 251
Design of these measures 251
Character of the nobles; William of Orange 251
Philip renews the persecuting edicts 252
The Inquisition and its cruelties 253
Orange and Egmont complain of Granvelle to the King . . . 253
How far Granvelle was responsible 253
He leaves the country (1564) 254
Speech of William of Orange against the policy of the government . 254
Egmont goes to Spain to enlighten the King 254
He is duped by the assurances of Philip 255
Effect of the continued cruelties 255
The "Compromise" (1566) 255
The Regent allows Protestant preaching outside of the cities . . 256
Philip promises to mitigate his policy; the proof of his perfidy . . 256
Iconoclasm (1566) 256
The Regent makes a truce with the Confederacy of Nobles . . 256
Orange leaves the country 257
Vengeance of Philip; mission of the Duke of Alva (1567) . . . 258
He arrests Egmont and Horn; the "Council of Blood" . . . 259
Alva defeats Louis of Nassau; Egmont and Horn are beheaded (1568) 260
Alva's plan of taxation (1569) 260
The spirit of resistance is awakened 260
The "Sea-beggars"; they capture Briel (1572) 260

PAGE

Holland and Zealand adopt a free constitution; Orange made Stadtholder (1572) 261
Alva detested by the people; he is recalled (1573) 261
Requesens succeeds him (1573) 261
Growth of a Protestant state under Orange 261
Flanders and Brabant invoke his help; the Pacification of Ghent (1576) 262
Don John succeeds Requesens (1576) 262
Division between the Southern and Northern Provinces . . . 262
Alexander of Parma succeeds Don John (1578) 262
The Utrecht Union formed in the North (1579) 263
Outlawry of William of Orange (1580); his "Apology" . . . 263
His character 264
His assassination (1584) 265
The Catholic Provinces submit to Parma 265
Philip's intention to remove him; death of Parma (1592) . . . 265
Rise of the Dutch Republic; disasters of Philip and of Spain . . 266
The Anabaptists 266
Prevalence of Calvinism 266
The Calvinists do not adopt the principle of toleration . . . 267
Difference between Protestants and Catholics in respect to intolerance 267
William of Orange advocates religious liberty 268
Controversy on the relation of the Church to the civil authority . 269
Germs of the Arminian controversy 269

CHAPTER X

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND

Lollards numerous at the beginning of the sixteenth century . . 270
Influence of the Revival of learning 270
Cardinal Wolsey a friend of learning 270
Tyndale (d. 1536) and Frith (d. 1533) 271
The peculiarity of the English Reformation 271
No prominent leaders as on the Continent 271
Henry VIII. seeks a divorce from Clement VII. (1527) . . . 272
Henry reduces the power of the Pope and the clergy in England . 273
Revives the statute of "præmunire" (1531) 273
Addressed by the clergy as Head of the English Church . . . 273
Is divorced and marries Anne Boleyn (1532) 273
The act of Supremacy (1534) 274
Abolishing of the monasteries (1536) 274
A Catholic and a Protestant party in the Council and in the Church 274
Cranmer leads the Protestant party; his character 275
Thomas Cromwell; Gardiner 275
The English Bible issued by the King's authority 275
The Ten Articles (1536) 275
The Rebellion of 1536 276
The Catholic party in the ascendency; the Six Articles (1539) . . 276
The Fall of Cromwell (1540) 276
Antagonism of the two parties after Henry's death (1547) . . . 277
Protestantism prevails under Edward VI. 278

PAGE
Cranmer reinforced by theologians from the Continent . . . 278
The Book of Common Prayer (1548, 1552); the Articles of Religion (1552) 278
The progress too rapid for the popular feeling 278
Fall of the Protector Somerset (1551) 279
Revisal of the ecclesiastical statutes 279
Reactionary movement under Mary (1553–58) 279
Restoration of the Catholic system; her marriage with Philip II. (1554) 279
Martyrdom of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer (1555–56) . . . 280
The character of Cranmer 280
Unpopularity of Mary and its causes 281
Extreme demands of Pope Paul IV. 281
Accession of Elizabeth (1558); her conservative Protestantism . . 282
Revision of the Articles (1563) 282
Act of Supremacy and Acts of Uniformity (1559); Court of High Commission (1583) 282
Treatment of the Catholics 283
Distinction between the Anglican Church and the Protestant Churches on the Continent 283
Little controversy on Episcopacy in the first age of the Reformation 283
Fraternal relation of the English and the Continental Churches . . 284
Cranmer asserts the parity of the clergy 284
Testimony of Lord Bacon; position of Hooker (1553–1600) . . 285
Agreement of the Anglican and Continental Churches on predestination 286
The Augustinian and Calvinistic doctrine compared 287
Influence of Calvin and of his writings in England 288
Anglican divines not rigid predestinarians 288
Anglican doctrine Calvinistic on the Eucharist 289
This doctrine expressed in the Articles 291
The Puritan objections to the vestments 291
Views of Jewel and other Elizabethan bishops 292
The Queen's opposition to changes in the ritual 293
Her enforcement of uniformity 294
Cartwright an advocate of Presbyterianism (1572) 294
The bearing of his principles on the Queen's Supremacy . . . 295
Rise of the Independents; their principles 295
Hooker on Church government and on the relation of Church and State 296
Merits of the controversy of the Anglicans and Puritans . . . 297
Lord Bacon's review of it 297
No iconoclasm in England 298
Connection of the Scottish Reformation with Elizabeth . . . 299
Character of the Scottish nobility; of the commons 299
The clergy ignorant and vicious; their wealth 300
Treatment of Protestantism under the Regent Mary (1554–60) . . 300
Return of Knox from the Continent (1559) 301
The education of Knox; begins to preach; a captive in France (1547) 301
He resides at Geneva (1556–59); his "Monstrous Regimen of Women" 302
The Covenant of the Lords of the Congregation (1557) . . . 302
The preaching of Knox; iconoclasm 303
Elizabeth sends troops to aid the lords (1560) 303
Death of the Queen-Regent (1560); legal establishment of Protestantism (1560) 303

PAGE

The ecclesiastical property, how used 303
Return of Mary, Queen of Scots, from France (1561); her character 304
She does not resist Protestantism; grounds of her policy . . . 305
Knox's opposition to the mass in her Chapel (1561) 306
Conference of Knox and the Queen 306
Their debate on the "regimen of women" 307
On the right of subjects to resist their sovereign 308
Knox's opinion of Mary 309
He preaches against the dancing at Holyrood; another conference with Mary 310
The people suppress the mass in the western districts (1563) . . 310
Knox defends their conduct in a conversation with the Queen . . 310
Knox arraigned for convening her lieges 312
He describes his examination before her and the Privy Council . . 312
Knox's public prayer for the Queen and the realm 312
He considers toleration of Catholic worship a sin 313
Mary's marriage with Darnley (1565) 314
It displeases Elizabeth; Mary's hopes center in Spain and the Guises 314
Murder of Rizzio by Darnley and the jealous nobles (1566) . . 315
Mary's repugnance to Darnley and attachment to Bothwell . . 316
Circumstances preceding the murder of Darnley 317
Abduction of the Queen by Bothwell (1567) 318
He is divorced from his wife and marries Mary (1567) . . . 319
She surrenders to the lords at Carberry Hill (1567) 319
The problem of the "casket letters" 319
Mary abdicates in favor of her son; makes Murray Regent (1567) . 321
Constitution of the Kirk; the Second Book of Discipline (1577–81) 322
Full establishment of the Presbyterian system (1592) 323
Mary escapes from Lochleven (1568); is defeated at Langside (1568); a prisoner in England 323
Hostility of the Catholic Reaction to Elizabeth 324
She sends help to the Netherlands (1585) 324
Execution of Mary (1587) 325
Defeat of the Spanish Armada (1588) 325
Protestantism in Ireland 325
Effect of the Catholic Reaction on the Irish 326
Lord Bacon on the way to treat Ireland 326

CHAPTER XI

THE REFORMATION IN ITALY AND SPAIN; THE COUNTER-REFORMATION IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

Resistance to Protestantism organized in Italy and Spain . . . 327
Political condition of Italy in its bearing on Protestantism . . 327
The corruption of the Church understood by Italians 328
Arnold of Brescia (d. 1155) 328
Dante (1265–1321) attacks the temporal power, but not the Catholic dogmas 328
His ideal of the restored Empire 329
How Boccaccio (1313–75) treats the Church and the clergy . . 330
The spirit of the Renaissance; Laurentius Valla (d. 1465) . . . 330
The service of Humanism and its limits; the academies . . . 330

PAGE

Diffusion of Lutheran writings in Italy 331
Protestantism in Italy a thing of degrees 332
The Oratory of Divine Love; Contarini 332
The reformed opinions in Ferrara; the Duchess Renée (1527) . . 333
Protestantism in other cities 334
In Naples; Juan Valdés (circa 1530) 334
Ochino and Peter Martyr 335
Treatise on the "Benefits of Christ" 335
The Sacramentarian dispute 335
Paul III. (1534–49) favors the Catholic reforming party (1537) . . 335
Contarini at Ratisbon (1541) 336
Caraffa leads the rigidly orthodox party of reform 336
New orders; the Theatines (1524) 337
Ignatius Loyola (1491–1556) founds the order of the Jesuits (1540) 337
His book of "Spiritual Exercises" 338
The constitution of the Jesuit order 339
The Council of Trent (1545–1563) 340
Its definitions are anti-Protestant 341
Its practical work in the way of reform 341
The Council serves to consolidate the Catholic Church . . . 341
The Inquisition; its history; the Spanish Inquisition . . . 341
The Inquisition in Italy (1542), how organized 343
Flight of Ochino (1542), Peter Martyr (1542), Vergerio (1548) . . 343
Persecution of Protestants 343
Suppression of Books; the Index Prohibitorius (1557) . . . 343
The Index Expurgatorius 344
Persecution of Evangelical Catholics 344
Extirpation of Protestantism in Italy 344
Introduction of Protestantism into Spain 345
Converts to Protestantism at Seville and Valladolid 345
Reception of the doctrine of Justification by Faith 346
Autos da fé (1559–60) 346
Success of the Inquisition 347
Persecution of the Evangelical Catholics; Carranza (1558–1576) . 347
Attitude of the Popes in respect to the Catholic Reaction; Paul IV. (1555–59); Pius IV. (1559–65); Pius V. (1566–72) . . . 348
Sixtus V. excommunicates Henry IV. (1585), and supports the League 349
Change in the intellectual spirit of Italy; Tasso (1544–95); the new schools of painting 349
Carlo Borromeo's private virtues and Christian work (1538–84) . . 350
The Jesuits as educators 350
They extend their influence in Europe 350
Countries recovered to the Church of Rome 351
Causes of the check of Protestantism; Macaulay's discussion . . 351
The crystallizing of parties 352
Political arrangements 352
The removal of abuses in the Church of Rome 353
Protestants waste their strength in contests with one another . . 353
The better organization of the Roman Catholics 354
They use the varieties of talents and character 354
More rooted attachment in Southern Europe to the Church of Rome 354
Discord arises in the Roman Catholic Party; its effect . . . 355

CHAPTER XII

THE STRUGGLE OF PROTESTANTISM IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

PAGE

Reverses experienced by the Catholic Reaction 356
Principal topics to be considered 356
Failure of Charles V. to subjugate the Protestants 356
Effect of the Peace of Augsburg (1555); Philip II. not supported by Ferdinand I. and Maximilian II. 357
Their successors under the sway of the Jesuits and the Catholic Reaction 357
Origin of the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648) 358
The Evangelical Union (1608); the Catholic League led by Maximilian of Bavaria (1609) 358
The Bohemians revolt against Ferdinand II.; give their crown to Frederic V., the Elector Palatine (1619) 359
Bigotry of Ferdinand II., and of the Elector 359
Defeat of the Bohemians; conquest of the Palatine (1622) . . 359
Triple alliance for the restoration of the Elector (1625) . . . 359
Failure of the Danish intervention (1626–1629) 360
Wallenstein delivers Ferdinand from subjection to the League . . 360
The constitution of the armies; the miseries of the war . . . 360
Victories of Wallenstein and of Tilly (1626–1629) 361
The Edict of Restitution (1629); the removal of Wallenstein (1630) 361
Intervention of Gustavus Adolphus (1630); his character and motives 362
Victories of Gustavus; Wallenstein reappointed (1632); the battle of Lutzen (1632) 362
Influence of Richelieu (1624–1642); ground of French intervention . 362
The death of Wallenstein (1634) 364
Predominance of Richelieu in the conduct of the war (1634) . . 364
The struggle protracted, and why 364
The Peace of Westphalia (1648) 365
Position of England under the Stuarts 365
Widening gulf between Anglicans and Puritans 366
Hostility of James I. (1603–1625) to the Puritans; the Hampton Court Conference (1604) 366
Charles I. (1625–1649); his arbitrary system of government . . 368
Archbishop Laud (1633) 368
The League and Covenant of the Scots (1638) 369
The war between King and Parliament (1642) 369
The Westminster Assembly; parties in it (1642) 369
Establishment of Presbyterianism; how limited 370
Cromwell (1653–1658) and the Independents 370
The settlers of New England (1620) 371
Their ecclesiastical system 371
Distinction between the Massachusetts and Plymouth settlers . . 371
Protestantism in Europe protected by Cromwell 372
Restoration of Charles II. (1660); how effected 372
The Presbyterians are deceived by the King 372
The Savoy Conference (1661) 373
Ejection of the Puritan ministers (1662) 373
Demoralization of the English Court 374
Alliance of Charles II. and Louis XIV. (1670) 374

PAGE

Real designs of Charles betrayed 374
James II. (1685–1688); the Court of High Commission (1686) . . 375
He endeavors to win the support of the Puritans (1687) . . . 375
The Revolution of 1688 375
The Act of Toleration 375
Failure of the Comprehension Bill 376
Permanent establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland (1690) . 376
Persecution of the Covenanters under James II. 377
Effect of Henry IV.'s death (1589) on the French policy . . . 377
Revolt of the Huguenots (1621); its causes and effect . . . 378
Louis XIII. (1610–1643); the aims of Richelieu (1624–1642) . . 378
His domestic policy; his destruction of the Huguenot power (1628) 378
Louis XIV. (1651–1715); his designs in respect to France and to foreign powers 379
The Assembly of 1682; the Four Propositions of Gallican liberty 380
Adjustment with Innocent XII. (1691–1700); the work of Bossuet . 380
Jansenism 380
Declining reputation of the Jesuits; Pascal (1623–1662) . . . 381
Suppression of Port Royal 1710; persecution of the Jansenists . 381
Persecution of the Huguenots; Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) 382
Its effect on France 383
Wars kindled by the ambition of Louis XIV. 383
William of Orange (1650–1702), his antagonist 384
The result 384
Prostration of the Catholic Reaction 385
Feebleness of the Papacy 385
Effect of the persecution of the Jansenists on the Catholic Church 385
Approach of the era of revolutions 385

CHAPTER XIII

THE PROTESTANT THEOLOGY

Two fundamental principles of Protestantism 387
No controversy between the two parties on the Trinity and Atonement 387
Their difference on the doctrine of sin 387
The Protestant doctrine of justification 388
The relation of ethics to religion 389
Protestant doctrine of the exclusive authority of the Scriptures . 389
Agreement of the Protestant Churches on this point 390
The two Protestant principles unite in one 390
Roman Catholic doctrine of justification 390
The Protestant doctrine respecting the Church 391
The Roman Catholic doctrine respecting the Church 392
Respecting tradition 392
Respecting the sacraments 393
Sense of the phrase, ex opere operato 393
Modifications of the Roman Catholic view 394
Roman Catholic doctrine of the priesthood 394
Protestants maintain a universal priesthood of believers . . . 395

PAGE
Protestant view of the number and design of the sacraments . . 395
Effect of the Protestant view of justification upon various dogmas and practices 395
Protestant controversies on predestination 397
Arminianism and its leaders (1610) 398
Political division between Arminians and Calvinists in Holland . . 399
The Synod of Dort (1616) 399
Arminian view of original sin and of the atonement 399
General character of the Arminian theologians 400
The Anabaptists 400
The Antitrinitarians of the age of the Reformation 401
Rise of Unitarianism in Italy 402
Faustus Socinus (1539–1604) 402
The Socinian theology 403
Efforts to unite Lutherans and Calvinists 404
Efforts to unite Protestants and Roman Catholics 405
The endeavors of Grotius (1642) 406
His doctrinal position 406
Leibnitz and Bossuet 407
End of the efforts at reunion 408

CHAPTER XIV

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES AND THEIR RELATION TO THE CIVIL AUTHORITY

Organization of Protestantism not uniform in the different countries 410
Protestants united in opposing Church government by a priesthood 410
The principles of Luther respecting Church polity 411
Not realized and why 411
Luther and Melancthon on the authority of civil rulers in the Church 411
Two characteristic features of the Lutheran polity 413
Origin of consistories 413
The Synod of Homberg in Hesse 414
Luther's opinion of its plan of Church government 415
Ecclesiastical government by princes in Lutheran states . . . 415
Theories on which it was founded 416
Church government in the Reformed Churches 416
Zwingli's system 416
Calvin's theory of Church government 417
The civil authority bound to suppress error 417
The Presbyterian constitution in France and in Scotland . . . 419
The Anglican establishment 420
Various theories; Erastianism; Hooker 420
Warburton's theory; Coleridge's theory 421
Gladstone; Chalmers; Macaulay 422
Convocation in the English Church 423
Bellarmine on the indirect authority of the Pope in relation to the temporal power 425
The Jesuits advocate popular sovereignty 425
Protestants maintain the divine right of kings 426
The system of the New England colonists 426

PAGE

Distinction between Plymouth and Massachusetts 427
The New England Ecclesiastical System 427
Roger Williams advocates religious liberty (circa 1635) . . . 427
The Roman Catholic Church in the United States 428

CHAPTER XV

THE RELATION OF PROTESTANTISM TO CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION

Necessary to consider facts in connection with principles . . . 430
General comparison of Catholic and Protestant nations . . . 430
Passage from Macaulay 430
Passage from Carlyle 431
Influence of Protestantism upon liberty 432
Political effects of the Reformation 433
What Protestantism did for liberty in Europe 433
In the United States 434
Protestants have been guilty of persecution 435
This admitted to be inconsistent with their principles . . . 436
Roman Catholics, how far responsible now for persecution . . . 436
Influence of the Reformation on literature and science . . . 438
The complaints of Erasmus 438
Effect of the extinction of Protestantism in Spain 438
Loss of intellectual freedom and activity 439
Effect of the extinction of Protestantism in Italy 439
Decline of literature and art 440
Persecution of Galileo 440
The grounds of his condemnation 441
Literature in France 442
The Prohibitory and Expurgatory Indexes 443
Effect of the censorship of books, on Italy 443
Censorship of books in Protestant countries 444
The press in the Puritan period; Milton 444
The press after the Restoration 445
Education by the Jesuits and their scholarship 445
The reading of the Bible; policy of the Church of Rome . . . 446
Why the laity first neglected the Bible 446
Intellectual effect of the reading of the Bible in Protestant countries 447
Influence of the Reformation on English Literature 448
Religious tone of Elizabethan writers 448
Effect of the Reformation on the German intellect 449
Its intellectual effect in Holland and Scotland 450
Influence of the Reformation on Philosophy 451
The Reformers' opinion of Aristotle 451
Renovation of philosophy by Bacon and Des Cartes 452
Bacon's tendency congenial with Protestantism 452
The Cartesian method in contrast with the Mediæval 452
Personal history and relations of Des Cartes (1596–1650) . . . 453
His system condemned by the Sorbonne 453
Influence of the Reformation on other sciences 454
Protestantism and the Fine Arts 454
Comparison of the German and the Latin nations 454

PAGE

Art in the Netherlands 455
Effect of the Reformation on Religion 455
Religion essential to civilization 455
Origin of infidelity in Europe 456
Protestant dogmatism provokes a revolt 456
This is carried to an extreme 457
Rise and spread of Deism 457
Transition to Pantheism 457
Skepticism in Roman Catholic countries 457
German Rationalism; its two forms 458
Rise of the Critical School 458
Deistic and Pantheistic Rationalism 459
Schleiermacher 459
Neander on the origin and types of Rationalism 459
Multiplying of Protestant sects 460
Its effects 461
Source of these divisions 461
Tendency to unity 462
Principle of progress in Protestantism 462
Protestant and Catholic Missions 462
Christianity not hostile to culture 463
Error of the Middle Ages 464
Protestantism avoids it 464

APPENDIX

I. A Chronological Table 465

II. A List of Books on the Reformation 475

INDEX 503

THE REFORMATION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE REFORMATION

The four most prominent epochs of modern history are the invasion of the barbarians, which blended the German and Roman elements of civilization, and subjected the new nations to the influence of Christianity; the crusades, which broke up the stagnation of European society, and by inflicting a blow upon the feudal system opened a path for the centralization of the nations and governments of Europe; the Reformation, in which religion was purified and the human mind emancipated from sacerdotal control; and the French Revolution, a tremendous struggle for political equality. The Reformation, like these other great social commotions, was long in preparation. Of the French Revolution, the last upon the list of historical epochs of capital importance, De Tocqueville observes: "It was least of all a fortuitous event. It is true that it took the world by surprise; and yet it was only the completion of travail most prolonged, the sudden and violent termination of a work on which ten generations had been laboring."[1] The method of Providence in history is never magical. In proportion to the magnitude of the catastrophe are the length of time and the variety of agencies which are concerned in producing it. Events, because they are unexpected and startling, are not to be ascribed merely to some proximate antecedent. The causes, like the consequences, are apt to be protracted. The Protestant movement is often looked upon as hardly less preternatural and astonishing than would be the rising of the sun at midnight. But the more it is examined, the less does it wear

[1] *Ancien Régime et la Révolution* (7th ed., 1866), p. 31.

this marvelous aspect. In truth, never was a historical crisis more elaborately prepared, and this through a train of causes which reach back into the remote past. Nor is it the fact that such events are wholly out of the reach of human foresight; they cast their shadows before; they are the object of presentiments more or less distinct, sometimes of definite prediction.[1]

But in avoiding one extreme we are not to fall into the opposite. We must take into account the personal qualities and the plastic agency of individuals not less than the operation of general causes. Especially if a revolution in long-established opinions and habits of feeling is to take place, there must be individuals to rally upon; men of power who are able to create and sustain in others a new moral life which they have first realized in themselves.

Notwithstanding that three centuries have since elapsed, the real origin and significance of the Reformation remain a subject of controversy. The rapid spread of Luther's opinions was attributed by at least one of his contemporaries "to a certain uncommon and malignant position of the stars, which scattered the spirit of giddiness and innovation over the world."[2] Although the astrological solution has no advocates left, it was not wholly implausible in that age when the ancient art of foretelling the future by an inspection of the stars counted among its believers so accomplished a scholar as Melancthon, a statesman as sagacious as Burleigh, and a far-sighted ecclesiastic like Pope Paul III., "who appointed no important sitting of the consistory, undertook no journey, without observing the constellations and choosing the day which appeared to him recommended by their aspect."[3]

[1] Twenty years before the accession of Louis XVI., Lord Chesterfield wrote: "In short, all the symptoms which I have ever met with in history, previous to great changes and revolutions in government, now exist and daily increase in France." Chesterfield's *Letters* (Dec. 25, 1753); quoted by Carlyle, *History of the French Revolution*, ch. ii. In the fifteenth century, there were able men who looked forward to an ecclesiastical revolution. Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, who as papal legate presided at the Council of Basle, in a letter to Pope Eugene IV., in 1431, predicted a great uprising of the laity for the overthrow of a corrupt clergy, and a heresy more formidable than that of the Bohemians. *Epist. I. Julian, Card.*, in the *Opera Æneæ Sylvii*, p. 66. It is given in part by Raynaldus, 1431, No. 22: extracts in Gieseler, Period. III. v. c. 1, § 132, n. 6.

[2] Jovius, *Historia*, Lut. 1553, p. 134; quoted by Robertson, *History of Charles V.*, book ii.

[3] Ranke, *History of the Popes* (Mrs. Austin's transl.), i. 249, 263. On the influence of astrology in Italy, from the thirteenth century, see Burckhardt, *Die*

But other explanations of the Protestant movement, which are hardly less imaginary and inadequate, have been gravely suggested. When the reigning Pope, Leo X., heard of the commotion that had arisen in Saxony, he spoke of it as a quabble of monks. This judgment, which, considering the t and the source from which it came, may not occasion much surprise, is reëchoed by writers so antagonistic to one another in their spirit as Bossuet and Voltaire: one the champion of the anti-protestant theology, and the other the leader of the party of free-thinkers in the eighteenth century.[1] Even a later German historian, a learned as well as brilliant writer, speaks of the Reformation as an academical quarrel that served as a nucleus for all the discontent of a turbulent age.[2] It is true that an Augustinian monk began the conflict by assailing certain practices of a Dominican, that each found much support in his own order, and that the rival universities of Wittenberg and Leipsic enlisted on opposite sides in the strife. But these are mere incidents. To bring them forward as principal causes of a mighty historic change, is a little short of trifling.[3] A class of persons dispose of the whole question in a summary manner by calling

Cultur d. Renaissance in Italien, p. 512 seq. In vain was it attacked by Petrarch and, in common with alchemy, denounced by some of the Popes. Melancthon professes his faith in astrology. *Corpus Reformatorum*, iii. 516. But the free-thinking Pomponazzi, and the celebrated publicist Bodin, shared in this credulity. (See Lecky, *History of Rationalism in Europe*, i. 284.) Cecil consulted astrology respecting Queen Elizabeth's marriage. In the sixteenth century, the famous astrologist, Nostradamus, was patronized by Henry II. and Charles IX., and was visited in his retreat at Salon by persons of the highest distinction. Even the great astronomers, Tycho Brahe and Kepler, did not give up the faith in astrology. The latter, from a study of the constellations under which Wallenstein was born, described his character (Ranke, *Geschichte Wallensteins*, p. 1). Wallenstein's own devotion to astrology is made familiar by the dramas of Schiller. Lord Bacon, although he pronounces astrology "so full of superstition that scarce anything sound can be discovered in it," would still "rather have it purified than altogether rejected," and admits into "Sane Astrology," predictions of seditions, schisms, and "all commotions or greater revolutions of things, natural as well as civil." *De Aug. Scient.*, III. iv. It is only as a branch of physics and on the basis of induction, however, that he allows any place for astrology.

[1] Voltaire, *Essai sur les Mœurs*, ch. 127, *Dict. Phil.* (Art. *Climat*); Bossuet, *Variations des Prot.; Œuvres*, v. 521. The same thing is said by Hume. "Martin Luther, an Austin friar, professor in the University of Wittenberg, resenting the affront put upon his order," etc. *History of England*, ch. xxix.

[2] Leo, *Universalgeschichte*, iii. c. 2.

[3] There is not the slightest ground for the notion that Luther was actuated by resentment at a slight upon his order. As if the disposal of indulgences were an honor that he coveted! But is it not true that this business had been usually given to the Augustinians? See Pallavicini, lib. I. c. 3, § 7; Waddington, *History of the Reformation*, i. 134. The origin of this imputation of jealousy is traced by Gieseler, *Church History*, iv. I. 1 § 1, n. 17.

the Reformation a new phase of the old conflict which the Popes had waged with the Hohenstaufen Emperors; of the struggle between civil and ecclesiastical authority. But the Reformation was not confined to Germany: it was a European movement that involved a religious revolution in the Teutonic nations, and powerfully affected the character and destiny of the Romanic peoples among which it failed to triumph. Moreover, while the political side of the Reformation is of great importance, both in the investigation of the causes and effects of Protestantism, this is far from being the exclusive or even predominant element in the problem. Political agencies were rather an efficient auxiliary than a direct and principal cause.

Guizot has presented his views respecting the nature of the Reformation, in a lecture devoted to this topic.[1] The Reformation, in his judgment, was an effort to deliver human reason from the bonds of authority; "it was an insurrection of the human mind against the absolute power of the spiritual order." It was not an accident, the result of some casual circumstance; it was not simply an effort to purify the Church. The comprehensive and most powerful cause was the desire of the human mind for freedom. Free thought and inquiry are the legitimate product, the real intent of the movement. Such is Guizot's interpretation. But he is careful to add that his definition does not describe the conscious purpose of the actors who achieved the revolution. The Reformation, he says, "in this respect performed more than it undertook, — more, probably, than it desired." "In point of *fact*, it produced the prevalence of free inquiry; in point of *principle*, it believed that it was substituting a legitimate for an illegitimate power." The distinction between the conscious aims of the leaders in a revolution, and the real drift and ultimate effect of their work; between the direct end which they endeavor to secure, and the deeper, hidden impulse, the undercurrent by which they are really impelled, is one that is proper to be made. It would appear evident, also, that the overthrow of the authority of the Church must affect the principle of authority in general; so far, at least, as eventually to lead to a scrutiny of the foundations of authority wherever it is assumed to exist. Yet we venture to consider the interpretation of Guizot defective as confining the import

[1] *General History of Civilization in Europe*, lect. xii.

and effect of the Reformation within too narrow limits. The Reformation claimed to be a reform of religion; it was certainly a religious revolution; and religion is so great a concern of man and so deep and pervasive in its influence, that this distinctive feature of the Reformation must be held to belong to its essential character. In other words, the ultimate motive and final effect is not liberty alone, but the improvement of religion likewise.[1]

There is a class of writers who would make the Reformation a transitional era paving the way for free-thinking or unbelief. We might say that there are two disparate classes who advocate this view. On the one hand, Roman Catholic writers have frequently declared Protestantism the natural parent of Rationalism; and on the other hand, Rationalists themselves, who reject Christianity as revealed, an authoritative system, have applauded the Reformation as a step toward their position. Both classes of critics proceed on the assumption, that the Christian religion is so far coincident with the mediæval system, that the fall of the latter logically carries with it the downfall of the former. Time was required for these latent tendencies of Protestantism to develop themselves; they were hidden from the eyes of the Reformers themselves; but, it is alleged, they have since become apparent. This character was imputed to Protestantism, on its first appearance, by its enemies, and is often charged upon it by its theological adversaries at the present day.[2] Thus, Balmes, the author of an extended work on the comparative effects of Catholicism and Protestantism upon civilization, maintains that the system which he opposes leads to atheism.[3] Another recent Roman Catholic writer affirms, that "the principle of Rationalism is inherent in the very nature of Protestantism."[4] For the opinions of the free-thinking school

[1] Elsewhere Guizot himself says that the Reformation was essentially and from the very first a religious reform; and that, as to politics, "they were its necessary means but not its chief aim." — *St. Louis and Calvin*, p. 150.

[2] Montaigne states that his father began to instruct his family in natural theology, on the first appearance of Protestantism, from the belief that it would lead to atheism. — *Essais*, II. xii.

[3] *Protestantism and Catholicism compared in their Effects on the Civilization of Europe* (English translation, Baltimore, 1851), p. 60, and the note, p. 428.

[4] J. B. Robertson, Esq., in the Life of Dr. J. A. Möhler, prefixed to the English translation of Möhler's *Symbolism*, p. xxxiii. But Möhler himself appears to dissent from the usual Catholic representation on this point, and to regard Rationalism as the opposite of primitive Protestantism. Part II. § liv. In

on this point, we may refer to the series of historical works by M. Laurent, which contain much valuable information, especially upon the Middle Ages.[1] This writer holds that Christianity itself is to give place to a religion of the future, the precise character of which he does not pretend to describe. He declares that revealed religion stands or falls with the Papacy, and that Protestantism "leads to the denial of the fundamental dogmas of historical Christianity."[2] He hails the Reformation as an intermediate stage in the progress of mankind to that higher plane where Christianity is to be superseded. Whether Protestantism fosters infidelity or not is a question which can be more intelligently considered hereafter. It may be observed here, however, that the Reformers themselves considered that their work arrested the progress of unbelief and saved the religion of Europe. Luther says that such were the ecclesiastical abuses in Germany that frightful disorders would infallibly have arisen, that all religion would have perished, and Christians have become Epicureans.[3] The infidelity that had taken root and sprung up in the strongholds of the Church, in connection with the revival of classical learning, threatened to spread over Europe. Melancthon, in a familiar letter to a friend, affirms that far more serious disturbances — "longe graviores tumultus" — would have broken out, if Luther had not appeared and turned the studies of men in another direction.[4] The Reformation brought a revival of religious feeling, and resulted, by a reactionary influence, in a great quickening of religious zeal within the Catholic body. Laurent himself elsewhere affirms that in the sixteenth century religion was in a state of decadence and threatened with ruin;[5] that Luther effected a religious revolution in the mind of an age that was inclined to infidelity and moving toward it at a rapid pace;[6] that he was a reformer for Catholicism as well as for Protestantism; that the Reformation

another place, however, he finds in pantheism a logical result of Protestant views of predestination. § 27.

[1] The title of the series is *Études sur l'Histoire de l'Humanité*, par F. Laurent, Professeur à l'Université de Gand.

[2] "Le protestantisme conduit à la négation des dogmes fondamentaux du christianisme historique." — *La Papauté et l'Empire* (Paris, 1860), p. 41.

[3] De Wette, *Luther's Briefe*, iii. 439.

[4] *Ad Camerarium* (1529), *Corpus Ref.*, i. 1083. See the remarks of Neander, *Wissenschaftliche Abhandl.*, p. 62.

[5] *La Réforme*, p. 447.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 434.

was the foe of infidelity and saved the Christian world from it. But we cannot pursue the topic in this place. Let it suffice here to interpose a warning against incautious generalization.

The Reformation, whatever may have been its latent tendencies and ulterior consequences, was an event within the domain of religion. From this point of view it must first, and prior to all speculation upon its indirect or collateral or remote results, be contemplated.

What was the fundamental characteristic of this revolution? Before, a vast institution had been interposed between the individual and the objects of religious faith and hope. The Reformation changed all this; it opened to the individual a direct access to the heavenly good proffered him in the Gospel.

The German nations which established themselves on the ruins of the Roman Empire, received Christianity with docility. But it was a Christianity, which, though it retained vital elements of the primitive doctrine, had become transformed into an external theocracy with its priesthood and ceremonies. It was under this mixed system, this combination of the Gospel with characteristic features of the Judaic dispensation, that the new nations were trained. Such a type of Christianity had certain advantages in relation to their uncivilized condition. Its externality, the legal character stamped on its theology as well as its organization, together with its gorgeous ritual, gave it a peculiar power over them. But all through the Middle Ages, whilst the outward, theocratic element that had been grafted on Christianity developed itself more and more in the polity and worship of the Church, the reactionary operation of the primitive, spiritual idea of the kingdom of God, characteristic of the Gospel, was likewise more and more manifest. Within the stately and imposing fabric of the ecclesiastical system, there was a force imprisoned, as it were, struggling for freedom, and gradually acquiring strength sufficient to break down the wall that confined it. "The Reformation, viewed in its most general character, was the reaction of Christianity as Gospel against Christianity as law." [1] It must also be remembered that with the traditional form of Christianity "there was handed down, in the sacred text itself, a source of divine knowledge not exposed in like manner to corruption, from which the

[1] Ullman, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, i. p. xiii.

Church might learn how to distinguish primitive Christianity from all subsequent additions, and so carry forward the work of purifying the Christian consciousness to its entire completion." [1]

Protestantism, therefore, had a positive as well as a negative side. It had something to assert as well as something to deny. If it discarded one interpretation of Christianity, it espoused another. Old beliefs were subverted, not as an effect of a mere passion for revolt, but through the expulsive power of deeper convictions, a purer apprehension of truth. The liberty which the Reformers prized first and chiefly was not the abstract right to choose one's creed without constraint, but a liberty that flows from the unforced appropriation, by the soul, of truth in harmony with its inmost nature and its conscious necessities.

It is evident, also, from the foregoing statement, that in Protestantism there was an objective as well as a subjective factor. The new type of religion, deeply rooted though it was in subjective impulses and convictions, owed its being to the direct contact of the mind with the Scriptures. In them it found alike its source and its regulative norm. This distinguishes Protestantism, historically considered, from all movements on the plane of natural religion, and stamps upon it a distinctively Christian character. The new spiritual life had consciously its fountain-head in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles. There was no pretense of devising a new religion, but only of reforming the old, according to its own authoritative standards.

Yet the Protestant Reformers, in transferring their allegiance from the Church to the Word of God, practically asserted a right of private judgment. Their proceeding was founded on a subjective, personal conviction. Deny to the individual this ultimate prerogative of deciding where authority in matters of religion is rightfully placed, and then what the acknowledged rule of faith means, and their whole movement becomes indefensible, irrational. Hence intellectual liberty, freedom of thought and inquiry, was a consequence of the Reformation, that could not fail to be eventually realized.

But while the Reformation in its distinctive character is a

[1] Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church* (Torrey's transl.), iii. 1 seq. The view taken in the paragraph above substantially accords with that of Neander in the passage referred to.

religious event, it is not an isolated phenomenon. It is a part and fruit of that general progress of society which marks the fifteenth century and the opening of the sixteenth as the period of transition from the Middle Ages to modern civilization.[1] This was the period of inventions and discoveries; when the magnetic compass coming into general use enabled adventurous mariners to steer their vessels into remote seas; when gunpowder revolutionized the art of war by lifting the peasant to the level of the knight; when printing by movable types furnished a new and marvelous means of diffusing knowledge. It was the era of great nautical discoveries; when Columbus added another hemisphere to the world as known to Europeans, and Vasco da Gama, sailing to India round the Cape of Good Hope, opened a new highway for commerce. It was likewise the era when the heavens were explored, and Copernicus discovered the true astronomic system of the universe. Then, also, the masterpieces of ancient sculpture and the literary treasures of antiquity were brought forth from their tombs. It was the period of a new life in art, the age of Raphael and Michael Angelo, of Leonardo da Vinci and Albert Dürer. The revived study of Greek and Latin literature was directing intellectual activity into new channels. Equally momentous was the change in the political life of Europe. Monarchy having gained the victory over feudalism, each of the principal kingdoms, especially France, Spain, and England, was becoming consolidated. The invasion of Italy by Charles VIII., in 1494, commenced the wars of which Italy was at once the theater and the prize, and the conflicts of the European States for the acquisition of territory or of ascendency over one another. To the intercourse of nations by means of commerce, which had spread from Venice, Genoa, and the towns of the Hanseatic League, through the rest of Western Europe, was added the intercourse of diplomacy. A state-system was growing up, in which the several peoples were more closely connected by political relations. In the various changes by which the transitional era is characterized, the Romanic peoples on the whole took the lead. But the Reformation in religion was not their work.

[1] Weber, *Weltgeschichte*, ix. 307. Duruy, *Hist. des Temps Modernes* (1453–1789), p. 1 seq. J. I. Ritter, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 142 seq. Humboldt, *Cosmos* (Bohn's ed.), ii. 601, 673, 683.

As Protestantism in its origin was not an isolated event, so it drew after it political and social changes of the highest moment. Hence it presents a twofold aspect. On the one hand, it is a transformation in the Church, in which are involved contests of theologians, modifications of creed and ritual, new systems of polity, an altered type of Christian life. On the other hand, it is a great transaction, in which sovereigns and nations bear a part; the occasion of wars and treaties; the close of an old and the introduction of a new period in the history of culture and civilization.

The era of the Reformation, if we give to the term this comprehensive meaning, embraces the interval between the posting of Luther's Theses, in 1517, and the conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648.

CHAPTER II

THE RISE OF THE PAPAL HIERARCHY AND ITS DECLINE THROUGH THE CENTRALIZATION OF NATIONS

One essential part of Protestantism was the abolition of the authority of the hierarchical order. Bossuet has remarked that if it is only abuses in the Church that separate Protestants from Catholics, these abuses can be remedied, and thus the ground of the existence of the schism is taken away.[1] But to say that the Reformation began in a protest against abuses of administration is simply to say that Protestantism was not full-grown at the start. In its mature form, as all the world knows, the Reformation was a rejection of papal and priestly authority. In studying the movement, this is one of the main points to which attention must be directed. In inquiring into the causes of the Reformation, therefore, we shall first review the rise and progress of the hierarchical system, and show how it had been weakened in the period immediately antecedent to the sixteenth century. We shall then contemplate a variety of facts which betokened a religious revolution and contributed to produce it.

The idea of the authority of the sacerdotal order is separable from the idea of papal supremacy within it. Yet, as a matter of fact, many of the causes that tended to the overthrow of faith in the latter doctrine, operated likewise to undermine the former. The keystone of the arch could not be loosened without affecting the stability of the whole structure. In the present chapter, the

[1] The extent of these abuses before the Reformation is admitted by the highest Catholic authorities. Bellarmine says: "Annis aliquot, antequam Lutherana et Calvinistica hæresis oriretur, nulla ferme erat, ut ii testantur, qui etiam tunc virebant, nulla (inquam) prope erat in judiciis ecclesiasticis severitas, nulla in moribus disciplina, nulla in sacris literis eruditio, nulla in rebus divinis reverentia, nulla propemodum jam erat religio." *Opera*, vi. 296; or Gerdesius, *Hist. Evang. renovati*, i. 25. Pope Adrian VI. confessed to the Diet of Nuremberg in 1522 that the deepest corruption had infected the Holy See and spread thence through the lower ranks of the clergy. Raynaldus, *Annales*, ann. 1522, No. 66; or Sleidan, l. iv. See, also, Bossuet, *Variations des Prot.*, livr. i. (*Œuvres*, v. 519). The Letters of Erasmus abound in corroborative testimonies.

rise and decline of the papal dominion will be the main subject of attention; and in treating of the second branch of the topic, the decline of the Papacy, we shall direct attention in particular to the influence of a certain cause which may be denominated the spirit of nationalism.

The religion of the old dispensation is declared in the Old Testament itself, by the prophets, to be rudimental and introductory to a more spiritual system. This character of inwardness belongs to the religion of Christ, which, for this reason, is fitted to be universal. Worship is set free from legal restrictions of a formal cast, and from the external and sensuous characteristics of the Jewish ritual. In one grand feature, especially, is the religion of the New Testament distinguished from the preparatory system — the absence of a mediatorial priesthood. The disciples were to form a community of brethren, who should be associated on a footing of equality, all of them being illuminated and directed, as well as united, by the one Spirit. The persevering efforts of the judaizing party to preserve the distinctive features of the Jewish system and foist them upon the Church, failed. The true, catholic interpretation of the Gospel, as giving liberty to the soul and direct access to God through the one high-priest who supersedes all other priestly mediation — that interpretation to which all of the Apostles assented in principle, but of which Paul was so clear and steadfast an expounder — prevailed in the Christian societies that were early scattered over the Roman Empire. Their organization was simple. The idea of one body in which, while all the members serve each other, they are still adapted to different functions, for which they are severally designated by the ruling principle — which, in the case of the Church, is the Divine Spirit — lay at the root. As was natural, all of the Christians in a town were united in one society, or ecclesia, the old Greek term for an assembly legally called and summoned. In each society there was a board of pastors, called indifferently elders, presbyters — a name taken from the synagogue — or bishops, overseers, a name given by the Greeks to persons charged with a guiding oversight in civil administration. In the election of them, the body of disciples had a controlling voice, although, as long as the Apostles lived, their suggestions or appointments would naturally be accepted. These officers did not give up, at

first, their secular occupations; they were not even, at the outset, intrusted as a peculiar function with the business of teaching, which was free to all and specially devolved on a class of persons who seemed designated by their gifts for this work. The elders, with the deacons whose business it was to look after the poor and to perform kindred duties, were the officers, to whom each little community committed the lead in the management of its affairs. The change that took place, either during or soon after the age of the Apostles, by which precedence was given in each board of pastors to one of their number to whom the title of bishop was exclusively appropriated, did not of itself involve any fundamental alteration in the spirit or polity of the churches.[1] But as we approach the close of the second century we find marked changes, some of them of a portentous character, such as indicate that the process of externalizing the Christian religion and the idea of the Church has fairly set in. The enlargement of the jurisdiction of bishops by extending it over dependent churches in the neighborhood of the towns, and the multiplying of church offices, are changes of less moment. But the officers of the Church are more and more assuming the position of a distinct order, which is placed above the laity and is the appointed medium of conveying to them grace. The conception of a priesthood, after the Old Testament system, is attaching itself to the Christian ministry. Along with this gradual change there is an imperceptible yet growing departure from the fundamental doctrine of salvation, as it had been set forth by Paul, and an adoption of a more legal view, in which faith is identified with doctrinal belief, and hence is coupled with works, instead of being their fruitful source. This doctrinal change and this attributing of a priestly function and prerogative to the

[1] The polity of the Church in the Apostolic age is admirably described by Rothe, *Die Anfänge d. Christl. Kirche u. ihrer Verfassung* (1837), although Rothe's particular hypothesis respecting the origin of the Episcopate has found little, if any favor. The Roman Catholic and a prevalent Anglican view, that the Episcopate, as a distinct office, was ordained by the Apostles for the whole Church, is maintained by Walter, *Kirchenrecht* (13th ed., 1681). The counterpart, on the Protestant side, of Walter's work is that of Richter, *Kirchenrecht* (7th ed., 1872). There is an able historical Dissertation on the "Christian Ministry" by Prof. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (2d ed., 1869). The more usual view of Protestants is advocated by Neander and Gieseler in their Church histories. See, also, Jacob, *The Eccl. Polity of the New Testament* (1872); Hatch, *The Hibbert Lectures* (1888); Lect. X. *Influence of* (*Greek*) *Mysteries on the Christian Church.* The controversial literature on the subject is very copius.

clergy, were not in any considerable degree the result of efforts on the part of Jewish Christians and of judaizing parties, which had been early overcome and cast as heretical sects beyond the pale of the Church. They were rather the product of tendencies in human nature, which are liable to manifest themselves at any time, and which serve to account in great part for the tenacious adherence of the Jewish sectaries to their ritual. But these tendencies were materially aided by the peculiar circumstances in which the early Church was placed, of which the abuse of the Pauline doctrine by Gnostic and by Antinomian speculations was doubtless one. There were causes which gave rise at once to the hierarchical idea or doctrine and to the hierarchical polity. The persecutions to which the Church was subject at the hands of the Roman government, and still more the great conflict with a swarm of heretical teachers who sought to amalgamate Christianity with various forms of Greek and Oriental philosophy, suggested the need of a more compact organization. The polity of the Church naturally took a form corresponding to political models then existing. Confederated government was something familiar to the Greek mind. The Church in the capital of a province, with its bishop, was easily accorded a precedence over the other churches and bishops in the same district, and thus the metropolitan system grew up. A higher grade of eminence was accorded to the bishops and churches of the principal cities, such as Rome, Alexandria, and Ephesus; and thus we have the germs of a more extended hierarchical sway.

Even as early as the latter part of the second century, the Church has passed into the condition of a visible organized commonwealth. We find Irenæus uttering the famous dictum that where the Church is — meaning the visible body with its clergy and sacraments — there is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church.[1] To be cut off from the Church is to be separated from Christ. The Church is the door of access to Him. We can also readily account for the importance that began to be attached to tradition; for the defenders of Christianity against Gnostical corruptions naturally fell back on the historical evidence afforded by the presence and testimony of the leading churches which the Apostles themselves had planted. Irenæus and Tertullian direct the inquirer to go to

[1] *Adv. Hæres.*, III. iii. § 1. Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons from 177 to 202.

Corinth, Ephesus, Rome, to the places where the Apostles had taught, and ascertain whether the novel speculations of the time could justly claim the sanction of the first disciples of Christ, or had been transmitted from them.[1] It is the preëminence of Rome, as the custodian of traditions, that Irenæus means to assert in a noted passage in which he exalts that Church.[2] But this sort of preëminence might contribute to prepare the way for another and a far different conception, which would connect itself with it. The unity of the Church, this great visible society of Christians, was realized in the unity of the sacerdotal body. It was natural to seek and to find a head for this body. And where should it be sought except at Rome, the capital of the world, the seat of the principal Church, where, as it was generally and perhaps truly believed, Peter as well as Paul had perished as a martyr? After Peter came to be considered the chief of the Apostles, and when, near the close of the second century, the idea was suggested and became current that Peter had been bishop of the Roman Church, a strong foundation was laid in the minds of men for the recognition of the primacy of that Church and of its chief pastor.[3] The habit of thus regarding the see of Rome, so far gains ground that in the middle of the third century we find a Cyprian whose zeal for episcopal independence would not tolerate the subjection of one bishop to another, still speaking of that see as the source of sacerdotal unity.[4] The influences that gradually built up the primacy of the Roman bishop, and had a special force of operation in the Western Church, were multiform. Rome had a preëminence and a grandeur in the estimation of men, such as no modern cities, however splendid, have ever rivaled. To that capital the nations had been accustomed to look with awe. Something of this reverence was easily transferred to the Church which had its seat in the Eternal City. The custom of regarding the Roman Empire as a divinely constituted theater for the Christian religion, which God had molded for this end by a long providential history, led men to consider the capital of the

[1] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, III. iii. Tertullian, *De Præscript. Hæret.*, c. xxxvi. Tertullian, a Presbyter at Carthage, died between 220 and 240.

[2] Lib. III. iii. 2

[3] The first mention of Peter as Bishop of Rome is in the *Clementine Homilies*, which were composed in the latter part of the second century.

[4] Ep. lv. *ad Cornel.*

Empire the predestined metropolis of Christianity. In times of persecution, the first intelligence of the gathering storm was often communicated from the Roman Church, whose bishops were likely to be the earliest victims. The Roman Church was revered as the only apostolic see in the West. Many of the churches of the West were planted by its agency; many received from it pecuniary aid. There were fewer cities than in the East, and hence fewer competitors to dispute the pretensions of the Roman bishop, and less room for the development of the metropolitan system, which in the East operated to a certain extent as a check upon the ambition of any single prelate. From the beginning, the Latin Church partook of the practical spirit of the race among whom it was planted; it kept on its path more steadily, while the East, swayed by the speculative spirit of the Greek, was convulsed by the great controversies in theology, which mark especially the fourth and fifth centuries. Through all the period of the Arian and Nestorian conflicts, the Roman bishop stood sufficiently apart from the contending parties to acquire great importance in their eyes and to make his support coveted by each of them. He was the powerful neutral whom it was for the interest of all factions to conciliate. The desire to gain the strength which the adhesion of so influential a prelate must give, would induce partisans to resort to him as an umpire, and to exalt his prerogative in flattering language, such as under different circumstances they would never have employed. At critical moments the Roman bishop actually interposed with doctrinal formulas which met with general acceptance; the most memorable instance being that of the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon (451), when the statement of the creed respecting the person of Christ was substantially drawn from the letter of Leo I. But how far the Eastern prelates were from acknowledging the pretensions of the Roman bishop was indicated at this very council, where a titular and honorary precedence was granted him, at the same time that equality in other respects was claimed for the Bishop of Constantinople, on account of his being bishop of "New Rome." Leo was cut to the quick by this proceeding of the council, which placed his authority on so precarious a foundation by making it dependent solely on the political importance of the city where it was exerted. He repels the declaration of the council with great warmth, and

asserts that the authority of spiritual Rome is founded on the fact that it is the see of Peter. Yet Leo does not renounce the advantages to be derived from the commanding political position of Rome, but skillfully interweaves this with the more vital consideration just named. He claims that the Roman Empire was built up with reference to Christianity, and that Rome, for this reason, was chosen for the bishopric of the chief of the Apostles. This idea as to the design of the Roman Empire passed down to later times. It is implied in the lines of Dante, where, speaking of Rome and the Empire, he says: —

> "Fur stabiliti per lo loco santo
> U' siede il successor del maggior Piero."[1]

If we watch the course of history for several centuries after the second, we observe that the attempts of the Roman bishops to exercise judicial or legislative functions in relation to the rest of the Church, now succeed and again are repulsed; but on the whole, under all these fluctuations, their power is increasing.

The accession of Constantine (311) found the Church so firmly organized under its hierarchy that it could not be absolutely merged in the state, as might have been the result had its constitution been different. But under him and his successors, the supremacy of the state and a large measure of control over ecclesiastical affairs were maintained by the emperors. General councils, for example, were convoked by them and presided over by their representatives, and conciliar decrees published as laws of the Empire. The Roman bishops felt it to be an honor to be judged only by the Emperor.[2] In the closing period of imperial history, the Emperors favored the ecclesiastical primacy of the Roman See, as a bond of unity in the Empire. Political disorders tended to elevate the position of the Roman bishop, especially when he was a person of remarkable talents and energy. In such a case the office took on new prerogatives. Leo the Great (440–461), the first, perhaps, who is entitled to be styled Pope, with the more modern associations of the title, proved himself a pillar of strength in the midst of tumult and anarchy. His conspicuous services, as in shielding Rome from

[1] "Were established as the holy place, wherein
Sits the successor of the greatest Peter."
Inferno, ii. 23-24.

[2] Gieseler, II. i. 3, § 92.

the barbarians and protecting its inhabitants, facilitated the exercise of a spiritual jurisdiction that stretched not only over Italy, but as far as Gaul and Africa. To him was given by Valentinian III. (445) an imperial declaration which made him supreme over the Western Church.

The fall of the Western Empire (476), in one important particular, was of signal advantage to the popes: it liberated them from subjection to the civil power. The fate of the Eastern Church and of the see of Constantinople might have been the fate of the Western Church and of Rome, had its political situation been equally unpropitious. The slavish condition to which the Roman bishops were reduced in the brief period of the full Greek rule in Italy, after the conquest of Justinian (539–568), proves how closely the vigor and growth of the papal institution were dependent on favoring political circumstances. From this ignoble servitude it was liberated by the Lombard invasion, which broke down the Greek power in the peninsula.

But the direct consequences of the fall of the Roman dominion in the West had been disastrous to the Church and to the Papacy.[1] Christian Britain had been conquered by the heathen Saxons from the continent. Arianism, a doctrine hostile to the orthodox creed in a cardinal feature, had spread far and wide among the Germanic tribes. The Greek Church, which became more and more distinct from the Latin, in language, creed, and ritual, attached itself with increasing loyalty to the Patriarch of Constantinople. As Arianism was, step by step, displaced by orthodoxy through the conquests of the Franks, the authority of the Papacy was not proportionately advanced. Even the power of metropolitans in the different countries sank, and the government of the Church rested in the hands of the kings and of the aristocracy of nobles and bishops. The bishops under the Merovingian kings amassed wealth, but led unholy lives, with little concern for the interests of religion. The disorder in the Frank Church reached its height under Charles Martel. At this time the heretical Lombards had founded their kingdom in the heart of Italy; and the Arabs, having carried their dominion over Africa and Spain, were advancing apparently to the conquest of Europe.

The fortunate alliance of the Papacy with the Franks was

[1] Giesebrecht, *Die Deutsche Kaiserzeit*, i. 92.

the event on which its whole mediæval history turned. They counted at their conversion, in the fifth century, only about five thousand warriors. They gained the ascendency over the Burgundians and Goths, and thus secured the victory of the Catholic faith over the Arian type of Christianity. This alone was an event of signal moment, in its ultimate bearing on the papal dominion. Then, under Charles Martel, at Poitiers (732), they defeated the Moslems, who, in their victorious progress, were encircling Christendom and threatening not only to crush the Papacy but even to extirpate Christianity itself. Under the shield of the Franks, Boniface went forth to accomplish the conversion of the Germans; himself an Anglo-Saxon, of the nation which had been won from heathenism by missionaries sent directly from that pontiff whose reign separates the ancient or classical from the mediæval era of the Church, Gregory the Great. The usurpation of Pepin, the founder of the Carlovingian line, was hallowed in the eyes of his subjects by the sanction obtained from Pope Zacharias (751). The political renovation of the Frankish monarchy was attended by an extension of the influence of the papal see. The Frankish Church was brought into closer connection with Rome. The primacy of Peter was universally recognized; it even acquired, through the labors of Boniface, a far higher significance than it had ever before possessed.[1] After the Lombards had wrested from the Greeks their provinces in Italy, and were threatening Rome, at a time, too, when, by the controversy about the worship of images, the Western Church was separated from the East and the Roman bishop was left to protect himself, he turned to the Franks for assistance against his heretical and aggressive neighbors. The deliverance achieved first by Pepin (754–55), and then by Charlemagne, resulted in the coronation of the latter, on Christmas Day, 800, in the Basilica of St. Peter, by the hands of the Pope. Thus Charles became in form what he had made himself in fact, the Emperor of the West. The idea of the perpetuity of the Roman Empire was never lost from the minds of men. In the coronation of Charles, the Pope virtually proceeded in the character of a representative of the Roman people, and his act signified the revival of the Roman Empire. Charlemagne, while he recognized the Pope as the spiritual head

[1] Giesebrecht, i. 97.

of the Church, demeaned himself as a master in reference to him, as in relation to his own bishops. But while the foundation was laid for the papal kingdom in Italy by the grants of Pepin and Charlemagne, a plausible ground was also furnished for the subsequent claim that the Pope, by his own authority, had transferred the Empire from the East to the West, and selected the individual to fill the throne.[1] In later times the coronation of Charles lent color to the pretended right of the pontiffs to exert a governing influence in civil not less than in ecclesiastical affairs.

As the divisions and conflicts of Charlemagne's empire after his death tended to exalt the bishops who were called in to act as umpires among rival aspirants or courted for the religious sanction which they could give to successful ambition, so did this era of disorder tend to magnify the power of the recognized head of the whole episcopate. In this period appeared the False or Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, which formulized, to be sure, tendencies already rife, but still imparted to those tendencies an authoritative basis and an augmented strength. The False Decretals brought forward principles of ecclesiastical law which made the Church independent of the State and elevated the Roman See to a position unknown to preceding ages. The immunity and high prerogatives of bishops, the exaltation of primates, as the direct instruments of the popes, above metropolitans who were closely dependent on the secular rulers, and the ascription of the highest legislative and judicial functions to the Roman Pontiff, were among the leading features of this spurious collection, which found its way into the codes of canon law and radically modified the ancient ecclesiastical system.[2] There was only needed a pope of sufficient talents and energy to give practical effect to these new principles; and such a person appeared in Nicholas I. (858–867). Availing himself of a favorable juncture, he exercised the discipline of the Church upon Lothair II., the King of Lorraine, whom he forced to submit to the papal judgment in a matrimonial cause, while he deposed the archbishops who had endeavored to baffle

[1] For the history of the papal kingdom in Italy, see the work of Sugenheim, *Geschichte der Entstehung u. Ausbildung des Kirchenstaates* (Leipsic, 1854); also, a review of this work in the *New Englander*, vol. xxvi. (Jan. 1867).

[2] On the date of the Pseudo-Isid. Decretals, see E. Seckel, in Hauck's *Realencyklopädie*, xvi. 265 seq. They first appeared about the middle of the ninth century.

his purpose. At the same time, Nicholas humbled Hincmar, the powerful Archbishop of Rheims, who had disregarded the appeal which one of his bishops, Rothad of Soissons, had made to Rome. Such exertions of power, for which the False Decretals furnished a warrant, seem to anticipate the Hildebrandian age.

Anxious to deliver themselves from the control which Charlemagne had established over them, the popes even fomented the discord among the Frankish princes; but the anarchical condition into which the Empire ultimately fell, left the Papacy, for a century and a half, the prey of Italian factions, by the agency of which the papal office was reduced to a lower point of moral degradation than it ever reached before or since.[1] This era — during a considerable portion of which harlots disposed of the papal office, and their paramours wore the tiara — was interrupted by the intervention of the German sovereigns Otho I. and Otho III.; with the first of whom the Holy Roman Empire, in the sense in which the name is used in subsequent ages, the secular counterpart of the Papacy, takes its origin.[2] The pontiffs preferred the sway of the Emperors to that of the lawless Italian barons.[3] This dark period was terminated by Henry III., who appeared in Italy at the head of an army, and, in 1046, at the Synod of Sutri, which he had convoked, dethroned three rival popes, and raised to the vacant office one of his own bishops.

The imperial office had passed into the hands of the German kings, and they, like their Carlovingian predecessors, rescued the Papacy from destruction. We have reached the period when Hildebrand (1073–1085) appeared with his vast reforming plan. While he aimed at a thorough reformation of morals and a restoration of ecclesiastical order and discipline, he coupled with this laudable project the fixed design to subordinate the State to the Church, and to subject the Church to the absolute authority of the Pope.[4] The prosecution of this enterprise, in which good and evil were almost inseparably blended, by Hilde-

[1] The degradation of the Papacy in this period is depicted in the darkest colors by the Roman Catholic annalist, Baronius, *Annales*, x. 650 seq. He even infers a special divine preservation of the Church and of the Holy See.

[2] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 80. This admirable work deserves to be read by every student of history.

[3] Von Raumer, *Geschichte der Hohenstaufen*, i. 20.

[4] Gregory's system is well described by Voigt, *Hildebrand als Papst Gregorius der Siebente, u. sein Zeitalter* (Weimar, 1846), p. 171 seq.

brand himself, and by a series of able and aspiring pontiffs who trod in his footsteps, occasioned the conflict between the Papacy and the Empire.

This conflict, with which mediæval history for several centuries resounds, was an inevitable consequence of the feudal system. The dependence of ecclesiastical princes upon their sovereign, and hence his right to invest them with the badges of their office, must be maintained; otherwise the kingdom would be divided against itself. On the contrary, such a relation on the part of bishops, independently of simony and kindred corruptions which were connected with the control of secular rulers over the appointment of ecclesiastics, was naturally deemed fatal to the unity of the sacerdotal body. To fix the bounds of authority between the two powers, the Papacy and the Empire, to whom the government of the world was supposed to be committed by the ordinance of heaven, was impracticable without a contest. That the Emperor was commissioned to preside over the temporal affairs of men, while the Pope was to guide and govern them in things spiritual, was too vague a criterion for defining the limits of jurisdiction. The coördination, the equilibrium of the two powers, was a relation with which, on the supposition that it were practicable, neither party would be content. It was a struggle on both sides for universal monarchy. Consequently our sympathies can be given without reserve to neither party, or rather they must be given to each so far as each labored to curb the encroachments and prevent the undue predominance of the other. Neither aimed at the destruction, but each at the subjugation, of the other. It was a battle where society would have equally suffered from the complete and permanent triumph of either contestant.

The Papacy had great advantages for prosecuting the warfare against the Empire, even apart from the fence of the religious sentiments which the head of the Church could more easily invoke in his favor. There was an incongruity between the station attributed to the Emperor and the fact that his actual dominion was far from being coextensive with Christendom. He could assert nothing more than a shadowy, theoretical supremacy over the other kingdoms of Western Europe. The Pope, on the contrary, was everywhere the acknowledged head

of Latin Christianity. If a jealousy for their own rights might tempt other kings to make common cause with the Emperor against papal aggressions, this feeling would be neutralized by the danger to other sovereigns that would follow from the triumph and undisputed exaltation of the Empire. Few kings were possessed of the magnanimity of St. Louis (Louis IX.) of France, who exerted all the powers of peaceful remonstrance to protect Frederic II. from the implacable vindictiveness of Gregory IX. Moreover, the relation of the German Emperors to the hierarchy of their kingdom was quite different from that held by Charlemagne, who acted the part of an ecclesiastical as well as a civil ruler. An indispensable and effective support the popes found in the German princes themselves, the great vassals of the Empire, and in their disposition to put checks upon the power of their sovereigns. The same cause which impeded the emperors in acting upon Italy aided the popes in acting upon Germany. The strength of the popes lay in the intestine divisions which they could create there. The attempt of Gregory VII. to dethrone Henry IV. would have been utterly hopeless but for the disaffection which the arbitrary conduct of Henry had provoked among his own subjects. On the contrary, the municipal spirit of liberty in the Italian cities, and their determined struggle for independence, provided the popes with potent allies against the imperial authority. The pontiffs were able to present themselves in the attractive light of champions of popular freedom in its battle with despotism. The crusades gave the popes the opportunity to come forward as the leaders of Christendom, and turn to their own account the religious enthusiasm which spread as a fire over Europe. The immediate influence of this great movement was seen in the augmented power of the pontiffs, and the diminished strength of the imperial cause.[1]

The Papacy was victorious in the protracted struggle with the Empire. The humiliation of Henry IV., whom Hildebrand kept waiting for three winter days, in the garb of a penitent, in the yard of the castle at Canossa, whatever might be the disgrace which it inflicted upon the imperial cause, was but the politic act of a passionate young ruler, who saw no other way of regaining the allegiance of his subjects (1077). When the lift-

[1] See Gieseler, III. iii. 1, § 48.

ing of the excommunication was found not to include the full restoration of his rights as a sovereign, he took up arms with an energy and success that showed how little his spirit was broken by the indignities to which he had submitted. The Worms Concordat which Calixtus II. concluded with Henry V. in 1122, and which provided both for a secular and a spiritual investiture, was a marked, though not a fully decisive, triumph of the Papacy. It was a long step towards complete emancipation from imperial sway.[1] But the acknowledgment which Frederic Barbarossa made of his sin and error to Alexander III. at Venice, in 1177, after a contest for imperial prerogatives which that monarch had kept up for nearly a generation, was an impressive indication of the side on which the victory was to rest. The triumph of the Papacy appeared complete when Gregory X. (1271–1276) directed the electoral princes to choose an emperor within a given interval, and threatened, in case they refused to comply with the mandate, to appoint, in conjunction with his cardinals, an emperor for them; and when Rudolph of Hapsburg, whom they proceeded to choose, acknowledged in the most unreserved and submissive manner the Pope's supremacy.

It was during the progress of the struggle with the Empire, that the papal power may be said to have culminated. In the eighteen years (1198–1216) in which Innocent III. reigned, the papal institution shone forth in full splendor.[2] The enforcement of celibacy had placed the entire body of the clergy in a closer relation to the sovereign pontiff. The Vicar of Peter had assumed the rank of Vicar of God and of Christ. The idea of a theocracy on earth, in which the Pope should rule in this character, fully possessed the mind of Innocent, who united to the courage, pertinacity, and lofty conceptions of Gregory VII., a broader range of statesmanlike capacity. In his view the two swords of temporal and ecclesiastical power had both been given to Peter and to his successors, so that the earthly sovereign derived his prerogative from the head of the Church. The king was to the Pope as the moon to the sun — a lower luminary shining with borrowed light. Acting on this theory, he assumed the post of arbiter in the contentions of nations, and claimed

[1] Giesebrecht, i. 917.
[2] Hurter, *Geschichte Papst Innocent d. Dritten*, 3 vols. (1841).

the right to dethrone kings at his pleasure. Thus he interposed to decide the disputed imperial election in Germany; and when Otho IV., the emperor whom he had placed in power, proved false to his pledges respecting the papal see, he excommunicated and deposed him, and brought forward Frederic II. in his stead. In his conflict with John, King of England, Innocent laid his kingdom under an interdict, excommunicated him, and finally gave his dominions to the sovereign of France; and John, after the most abject humiliation, received them back in fee from the Pope. In the Church he assumed the character of universal bishop, under the theory that all episcopal power was originally deposited in Peter and his successors, and communicated through this source to bishops, who were thus only the vicars of the Pope, and might be deposed at will. To him belonged all legislative authority, councils having merely a deliberative power, while the right to convoke them and to ratify or annul their proceedings belonged exclusively to him. He alone was not bound by the laws, and might dispense with them in the case of others. Even the doctrine of papal infallibility began to spread, and seems implied, if not explicitly avowed, in the teaching of the most eminent theologian of the age, Thomas Aquinas. The ecclesiastical revolution by which the powers that of old had been distributed through the Church were now absorbed and concentrated in the Pope, was analogous to the political change in which the feudal system gradually gave place to monarchy. The right to confirm the appointment of all bishops, even the right to nominate bishops and to dispose of all benefices, the exclusive right of absolution, canonization, and dispensation, the right to tax the churches — such were some of the enormous prerogatives, for the enforcement of which papal legates, clothed with ample powers, were sent into all the countries of Europe, to override the authority of bishops and of local ecclesiastical tribunals. The establishment of the famous mendicant orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic raised up a swarm of itinerant preachers who were closely attached to the Pope, and ready to defend papal prerogatives and papal extortions against whatever opposition might arise from the secular clergy. Gaining a foothold in the universities, they defined and defended in lectures and scholastic systems that conception of the papal institution in which all these usurpations and abuses were comprised.

But at the same time that the Papacy was achieving its victory over the Empire, a power was at work in the bosom of society, which was destined to render that victory a barren one, and to wrest the scepter from the land of the conqueror. This power may be described as nationalism, or the tendency to centralization, which involved an expansion of intelligence and an end of the exclusive domination of religious and ecclesiastical interests.[1] The secularizing and centralizing tendency, a necessary step in the progress of civilization, was a force adverse to the papal absorption of authority. The enfranchisement of the towns, which dates from the eleventh century, and the growth of their power; the rise of commerce; the crusades, which in various ways lent a powerful impulse to the new crystallization of European society; the conception of monarchy in its European form, which entered the minds of men as early as the twelfth century — these are some of the principal signs of the advent of a new order of things. Before the end of the thirteenth century, the last Syrian town in the hands of the Christians was yielded to the Saracens, and the peculiar enthusiasm which had driven multitudes by an irresistible force to the conquest of the holy places had vanished. The struggle of the Papacy with the Empire had been really itself a contest between the ecclesiastical and the lay elements of society. The triumph of the Papacy had been owing to the peculiar constitution and intrinsic weakness of the German monarchy. It had been effected by the aid of the German princes; but they, in their turn, were found ready to resist papal encroachments. From the time of the barbarian invasions, Europe had formed, so to speak, one family, united by the bond of religion, under the tutelage of the Papacy. All other influences tended to division and isolation. The empire of Charlemagne formed but a temporary breakwater in opposition to these tendencies. The German spirit of independence was unfavorable to political unity. The feudal system was an atomic condition of political

[1] "The gradual but slow reaction of the national feeling (des staatlichen Geistes) against ecclesiastical government in Europe (europäische Kirchenrecht), is, in general, the most weighty element in the history of the Middle Age; it appears in every period under different forms and names, particularly in the struggle about investitures and the conflict of the Hohenstaufen, is continued in the Reformation, in the French Revolution, and is still visible in the most recent Concordats and in the antagonisms of our own time."— Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, v. 561.

society. In this state of things, the Church, through its hierarchical organization under one chief, did a beneficent work for civilization by fusing the peoples, as far as its influence went, into a single community, and subjecting them to a uniform training. The mediæval Papacy, whatever evils may have been connected with it, saved Europe from anarchy and lawlessness. "Providence might have otherwise ordained, but it is impossible for man to imagine by what other organizing or consolidating force, the commonwealth of the Western nations could have grown up to a discordant, indeed, and conflicting league, but still to a league, with that unity and conformity of manners, usages, laws, religion, which have made their rivalries, oppugnancies, and even their long, ceaseless wars, on the whole to issue in the noblest, highest, most intellectual form of civilization known to man."[1] But the time must come for the diversifying of this unity, for the developing of the nations in their separate individuality. This was a change equally indispensable.

The development of the national languages which follows the chaotic period of the ninth and tenth centuries, is an interesting sign of that new stage in the advancement of civilization, upon which Europe was preparing to enter. It is worthy of notice that the earliest vernacular literature in Italy, Germany, France, and England involved to so great an extent satires and invectives against ecclesiastics. Many of the writers in the living tongues were laymen. A class of lay readers sprang up, so that it was no longer the case that "clerk" was a synonym for one who is able to read and write. "The greater part of literature in the Middle Ages," says Hallam, "at least from the twelfth century, may be considered as artillery leveled against the clergy."[2] In Spain, the contest with the Moors infused into the earliest literary productions the mingled sentiments of loyalty and religion.[3] But in Germany the minnesingers abound in hostile allusions to the wealth and tyranny of ecclesiastics. Walter von der Vogelweide, the greatest of the lyric poets of his time, a warm champion of the imperial side against the popes, denounces freely the riches and usurpations of the Church.[4]

[1] Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, ii. 43. See also iii. 360.
[2] *Literature of Europe*, i. 150.
[3] Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature*, i. 103.
[4] Kurtz, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, i. 48 seq., where passages are given.

It is true that the brute epic, of which Reynard the Fox may be considered the blossom, which figures largely in the early literature of Germany and the neighboring countries, was not didactic or satirical in its design.[1] But later it was converted into this use and turned into a vehicle for chastising the faults of priests and monks.[2] The Provençal bards were bold and unsparing in their treatment of the hierarchy until they were silenced by the Albigensian crusade. In Italy Dante and Petrarch signalized the beginning of a national literature by their denunciation of the vices and usurpations of the Papacy; while in the prose of Boccaccio the popular religious teachers are a mark for unbounded ridicule. English poetry begins with contemptuous and indignant censure of the monks and higher clergy, with the boldest manifestations of the anti-hierarchical tendency. "Teutonism," says Milman, "is now holding its first initiatory struggle with Latin Christianity." [3] "The Vision of Piers Ploughman," by William Langland, which bears the date of 1362, is from the pen of an earnest reformer who values reason and conscience as the guides of the soul, and attributes the sorrows and calamities of the world to the wealth and worldly temper of the clergy, and especially of the mendicant orders.[4] The poem ends with an assertion of the small value of popes' pardons and the superiority of a righteous life over trust in indulgences. "Pierce the Ploughman's crede," is a poem from another hand, and supposed to have been written in 1394. The poet introduces a plain man who is acquainted with the rudiments of Christian knowledge and wants to learn his creed. He applies successively to the four orders of mendicant friars, who give him no satisfaction, but rail at each other, and are absorbed in riches and sensual indulgence. Leaving them, he finds an honest ploughman, who inveighs against the monastic orders and gives him the instruction which he desires.[5] The author is an avowed Wick-

[1] Vilmar, *Gsch. d. deutsch. Lit.*, p. 296 seq.

[2] See Gervinus, *Gsch. d. deutschen Lit.*, i. 141.

[3] *History of Latin Christianity*, viii. 372. In this and in the three preceding chapters, Milman gives an interesting description of the early vernacular literatures. In ch. iv. he speaks of the satirical Latin poems that sprang up among the clergy and within the walls of convents.

[4] The poem is among the publications of the *Early English Text Society*. It is analyzed in the preface of Part I. Text A. See, also, Warton, *History of English Poetry*, sect. viii. (vol. ii. 44).

[5] The poem is published by the *Early English Text Society* (1867). Warton, sect. ix. (ii. 87).

liffite. Chaucer, in the picture of social life which he has drawn in the "Canterbury Tales," shows himself in full accord with Wickliffe in the hostility to the mendicant friars. Chaucer reserves his admiration for the simple and faithful parish priest, "rich in holy thought and work"; the higher clergy he handles in a genuine anti-sacerdotal spirit. In the "Pardoner," laden with his relics, and with his wallet

"Brimful of pardons, come from Rome all hot,"

he depicts a character who even then excited scorn and reprobation.

It is curious to observe in many of the early writers who have been referred to, how reverence for religion and for the Church is blended with bitter censure of the arrogance and wealth of ecclesiastics; how the spiritual office of the Pope is distinguished from his temporal power. In the one character he is revered, in the other he is denounced. The fiction of Constantine's donation of his western dominions to Pope Silvester, which was current in the Middle Ages, accounted for all the evils of the Church, in the judgment of the enemies of the temporal power. There was the source of the pride and wealth of the popes. Dante adverts to it in the lines: —

"Ah, Constantine of how much ill was mother,
Not thy conversion, but that marriage-dower,
Which the first wealthy father took from thee."[1]

And in another place, he refers to Constantine, who

"Became a Greek by ceding to the Pastor,"

and says of him in Paradise,

"Now knoweth he how all the ill deduced
From his good action is not harmful to him,
Although the world thereby may be destroyed."[2]

We find a like lament respecting the fatal gift to Silvester, in the Waldensian poem, "The Noble Lesson." Walter von der Vogelweide makes the angels, when Constantine endowed Silvester with worldly power, cry out with grief; and justly, he

[1] *Inf.* xix. 115. "Ahi, Costantin, di quanto mal fu matre,
Non la tua conversion, ma quella dote
Che da te prese il primo ricco patre!"

[2] *Parad.* xx. 58. "Ora conosce come 'l mal, dedutto
Dal suo bene operar, non gli e nocivo,
Avvegna che sia 'l ondo indi distrutto."

adds, since the popes were to use that power to ruin the emperors and to stir up the princes against them.[1] These bitter lamentations continue to be heard from advocates of reform, until the tale of the alleged donation was discovered to be destitute of truth.[2]

The anti-hierarchical spirit was powerfully reinforced by the legists. From the middle of the thirteenth century the University of Bologna rose in importance as the great seat of the revived study of Roman jurisprudence. As Paris was the seminary of theology, Bologna was the nursery of law. Law was cultivated, however, at other universities.[3] That a class of laymen should arise who were devoted to the study and exposition of the ancient law was in itself a significant event. The legists were the natural defenders of the State, the powerful auxiliaries of the kings.[4] Their influence was in opposition to feudalism and on the side of monarchy, and placed bulwarks round the civil authority in its contest against the encroachments of the Church. The hierarchy were confronted by a body of learned men, the guardians of a venerable code, who claimed for the kings the rights of Cæsar, and could bring forward in opposition to the canons of the Church canons of an earlier date.[5]

The effectual reaction against the Papacy dates from the reign of Boniface VIII., who cherished to the full extent the theories of Hildebrand and Innocent III., but was destitute of their sagacity and practical wisdom.[6] The resistance that he provoked sprang from the spirit which we have termed nationalism. The contest in which the Hohenstaufen had perished, was taken up by the King of France, the country which throughout the Middle Ages had been the most faithful protector of the Papacy, and whose royal house had been established by the

[1] Kurtz, *Gsch. d. deutsch. Lit.*, i. 50. The sonnet — "Der Pfaffen wahl" — is given by Kurtz, p. 56.

[2] The first public and formal exposure of the fiction was made by Laurentius Valla in the fifteenth century.

[3] Savigny, *Geschichte des röm. Recht*, iii. 152 seq.

[4] Laurent, *Féodalité et l'Église*, p. 630.

[5] Milman, vi. 241.

[6] Drumann, *Gsch. Bonifacius des Achten* (1852). An apologetic biographer of Boniface is Tosti, *Storia di Bonifacio VIII. e de' suoi tempi* (1846). In the same vein is the article of Wiseman (in review of Sismondi), *Essays on Various Subjects*, iii. 161 seq. Schwab, in the (Roman Catholic) *Quartalschrift* (1846, No. 1), considers that Tosti and Wiseman are unduly biased in favor of Boniface. His reign was from 1294 to 1303.

popes on an Italian throne as a bulwark against the Empire. It was ordained that their protectors should become their conquerors.[1] The conflict of Boniface with Philip the Fair is of remarkable interest for many reasons. One source of Boniface's anger was the levying by Philip of extraordinary taxes on the clergy and his prohibiting of the exportation of gold and silver from his kingdom. Another point, in the highest degree interesting, is the manner in which the rights of the laity in relation to the clergy come up for discussion. One defining characteristic of the Protestant Reformation was the release of the laity from subserviency to clerical control. There is something ominous in the opening words which give its title to one of the famous bulls of this pontiff: *Clericis laicos.* It begins with reminding Philip that long tradition exhibits laymen as hostile and mischievous to clergymen. Not less significant, in the light of subsequent history, is one of the responses of Philip to the Pope's indignant complaints, in which the king affirms that "Holy Mother Church, the Spouse of Christ, is composed not only of clergymen, but also of laymen;" that clergymen are guilty of an abuse when they try to appropriate exclusively to themselves the ecclesiastical liberty with which the grace of Christ has made us free; that Christ himself commanded to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. More remarkable still is the fact that Philip twice summoned to his support the estates of his realm, and that the nation stood firmly by its excommunicated sovereign. The pontifical assertions in regard to the two swords, the supremacy of the ecclesiastical over the temporal power, and the subjection of every creature to the Pope, who judges all and is judged by none, were met by a determined resistance on the part of the French nation. When Boniface summoned the French clergy to Rome to sit in judgment on the king, the act roused a tempest of indignation. The Papal Bull, snatched from the hand of the Legate, was publicly burned in Notre Dame, on the 11th of February, 1302. The clergy of France addressed to the incensed pontiff a denial of his proposition that in secular matters the Pope stands above the King. Finally all France united in an appeal to a general council. It was by two laymen, William of Nogaret, keeper of the king's seal, and Sciarra Colonna, that the personal attack

[1] Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter,* v. 560.

was made on Boniface at Anagni, which resulted shortly afterwards in his death (1303).

We have now reached the point when the prestige of the Papacy began to wane as rapidly as, in the preceding centuries, it had grown. This fall was due to the expansion of intelligence, to the general change in society to which reference has been made. But it was accelerated by influences which were subject, to a considerable extent, to the control of the popes themselves. It is the period of the Babylonian captivity, or the long residence of the popes at Avignon, and of the great schism. During a great part of this period the Papacy was enslaved to France, and administered in the interest of the French court. This situation impelled the popes to unjust and aggressive measures relating to Germany, England, and other Catholic countries, measures which could not fail to provoke earnest resentment. France was willing, as long as the Papacy remained her tool, to indulge the popes in extravagant assertions of authority, which could only have the effect to aggravate the opposition on the part of other nations. The revenues of the court at Avignon were supplied by means of extortions and usurpations which had been hitherto without example. The multiplied *reservations* of ecclesiastical offices, even of bishoprics and parishes, which were bestowed by the popes upon unworthy persons, or given *in commendam* to persons already possessed of lucrative places; the claim of the first fruits or *annates* — a tribute from new holders of benefices — and the levying of burdensome taxes upon all ranks of the clergy, especially those of the lower grades, were among the methods resorted to for replenishing the papal treasury. The effect of these various forms of ecclesiastical oppression upon public opinion was the greater, when it was known that the wealth thus gained went to support at Avignon an extremely luxurious and profligate court, the boundless immorality of which has been vividly depicted by Petrarch, an eye-witness.

The attempt of John XXII. to maintain the absolute supremacy of the Pope over the Empire and to deprive Louis of Bavaria of his crown, that he might place it on the head of the King of France, had an effect in Germany analogous to that produced in France by the conflict of Boniface and Philip. The imperial rights found the boldest defenders. At length, in

1338, the electoral princes solemnly declared that the Roman king receives his appointment and authority solely from the electoral college.

In England, from the Constitutions of Clarendon under Henry II., in 1164, there had been manifest a disposition to limit the jurisdiction and set bounds to the encroachments of the Church, and especially to curtail foreign ecclesiastical interference in the affairs of the kingdom.[1] Now that the Papacy had become the instrument of France, this spirit of resistance was naturally quickened. Two important statutes of Edward III. were the consequence: the statute of provisors, which devolved on the King the right to fill the Church offices that had been reserved to the Pope; and the statute of præmunire, which forbade subjects to bring, by direct prosecution or appeal, before any foreign tribunal, a cause that fell under the King's jurisdiction.

In this contest of the fourteenth century, "monarchy" was the watchword of the adversaries of the Papacy, the symbol of the new generation that was breaking loose from the dominant ideas of the Middle Ages. "The monarchists rose against the papists."[2] In France it was the rights of the throne and its independence of the Church which were maintained by the jurists, and by the schoolmen, as John of Paris and Occam, who came to their help. In Germany it was the old imperial rights as defined in the civil law, and as preceding even the existence of the Church, that were defended. In opposition to the political ideas of his master in theology, Thomas Aquinas, Dante wrote his noted treatise on monarchy, in advocacy of Ghibelline principles, against the claims of the popes to temporal power. Apart from the great influence of this book, and outside of Italy, the question of the origin of the Empire and the nature of monarchy in general, led to earnest investigation. In Germany especially, legists and theologians immersed themselves in historical and critical inquiries upon the foundation of civil authority, and the ground on which papal interferences with secular government professed to repose. These writers did not stop with confuting the notion that the Empire was

[1] The Constitutions of Clarendon are fully described by Reuter, *Geschichte Alexanders d. Dritten u. d. Kirche seiner Zeit.*, 3 vols. (1860).

[2] Gregorovius, vi. 124.

transferred by papal authority from the East to the West. The celebrated work of Marsilius of Padua, the "Defensor Pacis," went beyond the ideas of the age, and assailed even the spiritual authority of the Roman bishop. It denied that Peter was supreme over the other Apostles, and even denied that he can be proved to have ever visited Rome. This work maintained the supreme authority of a general council. The Minorites, or schismatical Franciscans, who insisted on the rule of poverty as binding on the clergy, and accused John XXII. of heresy for rejecting their principle, contended on the same side. William of Occam seconded Marsilius in a treatise entitled, "Eight Questions on the Power of the Pope." Occam, like Dante, rested his denial of the validity of the alleged donation of Constantine on the ground that an emperor had no right to renounce the inalienable rights of the Empire. He placed the Emperor and the General Council above the Pope, as his judges. Coronation, he said, was a human ceremony, which any bishop could perform. "These bold writings attacked the collective hierarchy in all its fundamental principles; they inquired, with a sharpness of criticism before unknown, into the nature of the priestly office; they restricted the notion of heresy, to which the Church had given so wide an extension; they appealed, finally, to Holy Scripture, as the only valid authority in matters of faith. As fervent monarchists, these theologians subjected the Church to the State. Their heretical tendencies announced a new process in the minds of men, in which the unity of the Catholic Church went down." It is to be observed that among the principal literary champions of Louis of Bavaria there was found a representative of each of the cultivated nations of the West.[1]

During the schism which ensued upon the election of Urban VI., in 1378, there was presented before Christendom the spectacle of rival popes imprecating curses upon each other; each with his court to be maintained by taxes and contributions, which had to be largely increased on account of the division. When men were compelled to choose between rival claimants of the office, it was inevitable that there should arise a still

[1] Gregorovius, vi. 129, 130. Copious extracts from the *Defensor Pacis*, which was the joint production of Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun, the Emperor Louis's physician, are given by Gieseler, III. iv. c. 1. § 99, n. 15.

deeper investigation into the origin and grounds of papal authority. Inquirers reverted to the earlier ages of the Church, in order to find both the causes and the cure of the dreadful evils under which Christian society was suffering. More than one jurist and theologian called attention to the ambition of the popes for secular rule and to their oppressive domination over the Church, as the prime fountain of this frightful disorder.

We have now to glance at the vigorous and prolonged endeavors, which proved for the most part abortive, to reform the Church "in head and members." Princes intervened to make peace between popes, as popes had before intervened to make peace between princes.[1] It is the era of the Reforming Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel, when, largely under the lead of the Paris theologians, a reformation in the morals and administration of the Church was sought through the agency of these great assemblies.[2] The theory on which D'Ailly, Gerson, and the other leaders who coöperated with them, proceeded, was that of episcopal, as contrasted with papal, supremacy. The Pope was primate of the Church, but bishops derived their authority and grace for the discharge of their office, not from him, but from the same source as that from which he derived his powers. The Church, when gathered together by its representatives in a general council, is the supreme tribunal, to which the Pope himself is subordinate and amenable. Their aim was to reduce him to the rank of a constitutional instead of an absolute monarch. The Gallican theologians held to an infallibility residing somewhere in the Church; most of them, and ultimately all of them, placing this infallibility in œcumenical councils. The flattering hopes under which the Council of Pisa opened its proceedings were doomed to disappointment, in consequence of the reluctance of the reformers to push through their measures without a pope, and the failure of Alexander V. to redeem the pledges which he had given them prior to his election. Moreover, the schism continued, with three popes in the room of two. The Council of Constance began under the fairest auspices. The resolve to vote by nations was a significant sign of a new order of things, and crushed the design of the flagitious Pope, John XXIII., to control the assembly by the preponderance of Italian votes. Solemn declarations of

[1] Laurent, *La Réforme*, p. 29. [2] (1409–1443.)

the supremacy and authority of the Council were adopted, and were carried out in the actual deposition of the infamous Pope. But the plans of reform were mostly wrecked on the same rock on which they had broken at Pisa. A pope must be elected; and Martin V., once chosen, by skillful management and by separate arrangements with different princes, was able to undo, to a great extent, the salutary work of the Council, and even before its adjournment to reassert the very doctrine of papal superiority which the Council had repudiated. The substantial failure of this Council, the most august ecclesiastical assemblage of the Middle Ages, to achieve reforms which thoughtful and good men everywhere deemed indispensable, was a proof that some more radical means of reformation would have to be adopted. But another grand effort in the same direction was put forth; and the Council of Basel, notwithstanding that it adopted numerous measures of a beneficent character, which were acceptable to the Catholic nations, had at last no better issue; for most of the advantages that were granted to them and the concessions that were made by the popes, especially to Germany, they contrived afterward, by adroit diplomacy, to recall.

If we look at the condition of Europe in the fifteenth century, after the time of the schism and the reforming councils, we observe that political considerations preponderate in the room of distinctly ecclesiastical motives and feelings.[1] National rivalries and the ambition of princes are everywhere prominent. The sovereigns of Europe are endeavoring to augment their power at the expense of the Church, especially by taking into their hands ecclesiastical appointments. It was during the fifteenth century that the European monarchies were acquiring a firm organization. In England the wars of the Roses ended with the accession of Henry VII., and in his son and successor the rights of both lines were united. In France the century of strife with England had been followed by the reduction of the great feudatories to subjection to the crown. In Spain, Castile and Aragon were united by the mar-

[1] The controversy, during this period, between the advocates of the aristocratic or Gallican and of the papal systems, is described, with copious citations from the polemical writers who participated in it, by Gieseler, *Church History*, III. v. i. § 136.

riage of their sovereigns, and their kingdom was consolidated by the conquest of Granada.

At this critical epoch, when it would have been in the highest degree difficult for pontiffs devoted to the interests of religion to breast the dominant spirit of nationalism, it appeared to be the sole ambition of a series of popes to aggrandize their families or to strengthen the states of the Church.[1] No longer absorbed in any grand public object, like the crusades, they plotted and fought to build up principalities in Italy for their relatives. To the furtherance of such worldly schemes, they often applied the treasures which they had procured by taxing the Church and from the sale of church offices. The vicious character of several of them augmented the scandal which this corrupt policy created. Sixtus IV., aiming to found a principality for his nephew, — or, according to Machiavelli, his illegitimate son Girolamo Riario, — favored the conspiracy against the lives of Julian and Lorenzo de Medici, which resulted in the assassination of the former on the steps of the altar, during the celebration of high mass. He then joined Naples in making war on Florence. In order to gain Ferrara for his nephew, he first incited Venice to war; but when his nephew went over to the side of Naples, the Pope forsook his Venetian allies and excommunicated them. Little regard was paid to this act, and his consequent chagrin hastened his death. Innocent VIII., besides advancing the fortunes of seven illegitimate children, and waging two wars with Naples, received an annual tribute from the Sultan for detaining his brother and rival in prison, instead of sending him to lead a force against the Turks, the enemies of Christendom. Alexander VI., whose wickedness brings to mind the dark days of the Papacy in the tenth century, occupied himself in building

[1] No adequate impression of the secularization of the Papacy can be gained without the reference to the historical details. One of the specially valuable works on the subject is "The Cambridge Modern History, *The Renaissance,*" vol. I. p. 653 seq. ch. xix., "The Eve of the Reformation," by Henry C. Lea. Another highly instructive work is the late Bishop Creighton's *History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation*, 5 vols. (1882–1894). In particular the period from 1420 to 1520 should be examined. The work of chief value from Roman Catholic sources is that of Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters etc.* 3 vols. (1886 seq.); in the English translation, 6 vols. It terminates at the death of Pope Julius II. (1513). The author had access to the Vatican papers. It has the merit of relating frankly much of the evil in the lives of the Popes during the period reviewed. See, for example, the pontificate of Sixtus IV.

432005

up a principality for his favorite son, that monster of depravity, Cæsar Borgia, and in amassing treasures, by base and cruel means, for the support of the licentious Roman Court. He is said to have died of the poison which he had caused to be prepared for a rich cardinal, who bribed the head-cook to set it before the Pope himself. If Julius II. satisfied the ambition of his family in a more peaceable way, he still found his enjoyment in war and conquest, and made it his sole task to extend the States of the Church. He organized alliances and defeated one enemy after another, forcing Venice to succumb, and not hesitating, old man as he was, to take the field himself, in winter. Having brought in the French, and joined the league of Cambray for the sake of subduing Venice, he called to his side the Venetians for the expulsion of the French (1510).[1]

This absorption of the popes in selfish and secular schemes was not in an age of ignorance, but just at the period when learning had revived and when Europe had entered upon an era of inventions and discoveries which were destined to put a new face upon civilization. The demoralized condition of the Church was a fact that could not fail to draw to itself general attention.

Leo X., made a cardinal at the age of thirteen and pope at thirty-seven, whose pontificate was to be signalized by the beginning of the Reformation, was free from the revolting vices which had degraded several of his near predecessors, and from the violent and belligerent temper of Julius II., who immediately preceded him.[2] Yet the influence of his character and policy was calculated to strengthen the disaffection toward the Papacy. Sarpi, in his "History of the Council of Trent," after praising the learning, taste, and liberality of Leo, remarks with fine wit, that "he would have been a perfect Pope, if he had combined with these qualities some knowledge of the affairs of religion and a greater inclination to piety, for neither of which he mani-

[1] Germany embodied its complaints against the corrupt and extortionate administration of Julius, as related to that country, in *Gravamina*. A revolt against ecclesiastics, or a great defection from the Roman Church, like that of the Bohemians, were declared to be imminent, if these evils were not corrected.— Gieseler, III. v. 1, § 135, n. 8.

[2] There is no ground for believing the scandalous charges of immorality which have been made against him. They are brought together from the original sources in Bayle's Dictionary.

fested much concern."[1] Even Pallavicini, the opponent of Sarpi, laments that Leo called about him those who were rather familiar with the fables of Greece and the delights of the poets than with the history of the Church and the doctrine of the fathers. He deplores the devotion of Leo to profane studies, to hunting, jesting, and pageants; to employments ill suited to his exalted office. If he had been surrounded by theologians, Pallavicini thinks that he would have been more cautious in distributing indulgences and that the heresies of Luther might, perhaps, have been quickly suppressed by the writings of learned men.[2] The Italian historians Muratori and Guicciardini, in connection with their praise of Leo, state the misgivings that were felt by wise men at the costly pomp which he displayed at his coronation, and censure his laxity in the administration of his office.[3] The chief pastor of the Church was seen to give himself up to the fascinations of literature, art, and music. In his gay and luxurious court, religion was a matter of subordinate concern. Vast sums of money which were gathered from Christian people were lavished upon his relatives.[4] Leo's influence fostered what Ranke has well called "a sort of intellectual sensuality."

It is true that occasionally the interests of sovereigns moved them tacitly to admit pretensions on the sides of the popes, that were fast becoming obsolete. In 1452 Nicholas V. granted to Alphonso, King of Portugal, the privilege of subduing and reducing to perpetual servitude, Saracens, Pagans, and other infidels and enemies of Christ, and of appropriating to himself all of their kingdoms, territories, and property of whatever sort, public or private; and two years afterwards, by the same

[1] "E sarebbe stato un perfetto Pontefice, se con queste avesse congiunto qualche cognizione delle cose della religione, ed aliquanto piu d'inclinazione alla pietà, dell' una e dell' altra delle quali non mostrava aver gran cura." *Istoria del Concilio Trid.*, lib. i. (tom. i. 5). Not very different is the estimate of a modern Catholic writer: "Er besass herrliche Eigenschaften des Geistes und Herzens eine feine Bildung, Kenntniss und Liebe für Kunst und Wissenschaft; aber für einen Papst war er viel zu vergnügungsüchtig, verschwenderisch und ländersüchtig." J. I. Ritter, *Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 143.

[2] *Istoria di Concilio di Trento*, tom. i. lib. i. c. ii.

[3] Muratori, *Annali d' Italia*, tom. xiv. 156. Guicciardini, *Istoria d' Italia*, tom. vi. p. 81. See, also, tom. vii. pp. 108, 109.

[4] Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, i. 255. Roscoe (*Life of Leo X.*, iv. ch. xxiv.) defends him against the imputation of unchastity, but does not conceal the pleasure he took in buffoonery, and mildly regrets his double-dealing in his intercourse with sovereigns.

"apostolic authority," he bestowed on him the new discoveries on the western coast of Africa. Alexander VI., in virtue of rights derived from Peter to the Apostolic See, assumed to give away, "of his mere liberality," to Ferdinand and Isabella, all the newly discovered regions of America, from a line stretching one hundred leagues westward of the Azores, and extending "from the arctic to the antarctic pole." Afterwards Ferdinand allowed to the King of Portugal that this line should run three hundred and seventy, instead of one hundred, leagues to the west of the Azores. But the importance of the popes in this period was chiefly dependent on their temporal power in Italy, and on the political combinations which they were able to organize. The concessions which they obtained from princes were often of more apparent than real consequence. This fact is illustrated in the surrender of the Pragmatic Sanction by Francis I. to Leo X. (1516).

In 1438, after the Council of Basel had passed its reforming measures, Charles VII. assembled the clergy of France in a great Synod at Bourges. Nearly two centuries before, that devoted son of the Church, Louis IX., — St. Louis of France, — had issued the famous Pragmatic Sanction, the charter of Gallican liberties, by which interference with free elections to benefices in France, and exactions and assessments of money on the part of the popes, except on urgent occasions, and with the king's consent, were forbidden. With this example before them, the Synod of Bourges asserted the rights of national churches, not only above the Pope, but also above the Council, a part but not all of whose reformatory decrees it adopted. It declared the Pope subject to a general council, and bound to convoke a council every ten years. The right of nomination to benefices was denied to the Pope, except in a few instances specially reserved, and appeals to him were restricted to the gravest cases. Among the provisions of the Bourges Sanction was the denunciation of annates and first-fruits as simony. The efforts of Pius II. and Paul II. to procure the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction were steadily resisted by the Parliament of Paris. When, therefore, Leo X. succeeded in obtaining from Francis I., after his victorious campaign in Italy, the abandonment of the Sanction, it seemed to be a great advance on the side of the Papacy. In reality, however, although the Gallican Church

was robbed of its liberties, the Pope gained only the annates, while the power of nominating to the great benefices fell to the king. Moreover, the coercion that was required to bring the Parliament to register the new Concordat, and the indignation which it awakened throughout France, proved that it resulted from no change in the sentiments of the nation.

The long struggle of Francis I. and Charles V., and the way in which it affected the fortunes of Protestantism, afford a constant illustration of the predominance which had been gained by secular and political, over purely ecclesiastical interests. There were critical moments when not only the King and the Emperor, but the Pope also, were led from motives of policy to become the virtual allies of the Protestant cause.

It is a striking incident, and yet illustrative of the spirit of the age, that the Emperor Maximilian sent word to the Elector Frederic of Saxony to take good care of Luther — "we might, perhaps, have need of him some time or other." [1] For fear that Charles V. would be too much strengthened by the destruction of the Protestant League of Smalcald, Pope Paul III. recalled the troops which he had lent to the Emperor, and encouraged Francis I. to prosecute his design of aiding the Protestants. The Pope sent a message to the French king, "to help those who were not yet beaten." At the moment when the Protestant cause might seem to be on the verge of extinction, the Pope and the King of France appear as its defenders. Francis even sought to make the Turks his allies in his struggle against the Emperor. What a change was this from the days when the princes and nations of Europe were banded together, at the call of the Church, to wrest the holy places from the infidels! [2]

Thus, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, there are two facts which arrest attention: —

First, the development and consolidation of the nations, in their separate individuality, each with its own language, culture, laws, and institutions, and animated by a national spirit that chafed under foreign ecclesiastical control.

Secondly, the secularizing of the Papacy. The popes had virtually renounced the lofty position which they still assumed to hold, and which, to a certain extent, they had once really

[1] Ranke, *Deutsch. Gsch.*, i. 216, *History of the Popes*, i. 86.
[2] Ranke, *Deutsch. Gsch.*, i. 83.

held, of moral and religious guardians of society. As temporal rulers, they were immersed in political contests and schemes of ambition. To further these, they prostituted the opportunities afforded by their spiritual function, and by the traditional reverence of men, which, though weakened, was still powerful, for their episcopal authority. It was unavoidable that they and their office with them, should sink in public esteem. "During the Middle Ages," says Coleridge, the Papacy was another name "for a confederation of learned men in the west of Europe against the barbarism and ignorance of the times. The Pope was the chief of this confederacy; and, so long as he retained that character, his power was just and irresistible. It was the principal means of preserving for us and for all posterity all that we now have of the illumination of past ages. But as soon as the Pope made a separation between his character as premier clerk in Christendom and as a secular prince — as soon as he began to squabble for towns and castles — then he at once broke the charm, and gave birth to a revolution." "Everywhere, but especially throughout the North of Europe, the breach of feeling and sympathy went on widening; so that all Germany, England, Scotland, and other countries, started, like giants out of their sleep, at the first blast of Luther's trumpet." [1]

[1] *Table Talk* (July 24, 1830). Almost the same statement as to the moral fall of the Papacy is made by a fair-minded Catholic historian. He traces its decline from the Babylonian captivity, through the period of the Reforming Councils, and the reign of Julius II. and the popes of the house of Medici. "Bis dahin hatten die Päpste durch ihr Vermittleramt über den Fürsten gestanden; jetzt aber stellten sie sich denselben gleich und erweckten, durch ihre Länder- und Kriegslust, Neid und Hass gegen sich. So war die ganze moralische Kraft, wodurch Rom seit vier Jahrhunderten die Welt beherrscht hatte, untergraben, und es bedürfte nur eines kräftigen Stosses, um sie über den Haufen zu werfen." J. I. Ritter, *Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 143.

CHAPTER III

SPECIAL CAUSES AND OMENS OF AN ECCLESIASTICAL REVOLUTION PRIOR TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

The mediæval type of religion, in contrast with primitive Christianity, is pervaded by a certain legalism. Everything is prescribed, reduced to rule, subjected to authority. Mediæval Catholicism may be contemplated under the three departments of dogma, of polity, and of Christian life, under which modes of worship are included.[1] Under this last comprehensive rubric, monasticism, for example, which springs out of a certain conception of the Christian life, belongs. The dogmatic system, as elaborated by the schoolmen from the materials furnished by tradition and sanctioned by the Church, constituted a vast body of doctrine, which every Christian was bound to accept in all its particulars. The polity of the Church lodged all government in the hands of a superior class, the priesthood, who were the commissioned, indispensable almoners of divine grace. The worship centered in the sacrifice of the mass, a constantly repeated miracle wrought by the hands of the priest. In the idea of the Christian life, the visible act was made to count for so much, ceremonies were so multiplied and so highly valued, that a character of externality was stamped upon the method of salvation. Salvation, instead of being a purely gratuitous act, flowing from the mercy of God, was connected with human merit. The quantitative, as opposed to the qualitative standard of excellence, the disposition to lay stress on performances and abstinences, instead of the spirit or principle at the foundation of the whole life, lay at the root of celibacy and the monastic institutions. The masses, pilgrimages, fastings, flagellations, prayers to saints, homage to their relics and images, and similar features so prominent in mediæval piety, illustrate its essential

[1] Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, i. p. 13 seq.

character. Christianity was converted into an external ordinance, into a round of observances.[1]

The reaction which manifested itself from time to time within the Church, anterior to the Reformation, might have a special relation to either of the constituent elements of the mediæval system, or it might be directed against them all together. It might appear in the form of dissent from the prevailing dogmas, especially from the doctrine of human merit in salvation; it might be leveled against the priesthood as usurping a function not given them in the Gospel, and as departing in various ways from the primitive idea of the Christian ministry, it might take the form of an explicit or indirect resistance to the exaggerated esteem of rites and ceremonies and austerities. In either of these directions the spiritual element of Christianity, which had become overlaid and cramped by traditions, might appear as an antagonistic or silently renovating force. A general progress of intelligence, especially if it should lead to the study of early Christianity, would tend to the same result.

The forerunners of the Reformation have been properly divided into two classes.[2] The first of them consists of the men who, in the quiet path of theological research and teaching, or by practical exertions in behalf of a contemplative, spiritual tone of piety, were undermining the traditional system. The second embraces the names of men who are better known, for the reason that they attempted to carry out their ideas practically in the way of effecting ecclesiastical changes. The first class are more obscure, but were not less influential in preparing the ground for the Reformation. Protestantism was a return to the Scriptures as the authentic source of Christian knowledge and to the principle that salvation, that that inward peace, is not from the Church or from human works ethical or ceremonial, but through Christ alone, received by the soul in an act of trust. Whoever, whether in the chair of theology, in the pulpit, through the devotional treatise, or by fostering the study of languages and of history, or in perilous combat with ecclesiastical abuses, attracted the minds of men to the Scriptures

[1] This fact is well represented by Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, i. p. xiii. seq., p. 8 seq.

[2] Ullmann, i. p. 15 seq.

and to a more spiritual conception of religion, was, in a greater or less measure, a reformer before the Reformation.

In the preceding chapter we have reviewed the rise of the hierarchical order, and have noticed one of the main causes, the tendency to centralization, the spirit of nationalism, which had weakened the authority of the clergy, and especially, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, had materially reduced the power of the Papacy.

We have now to direct attention to various special causes and omens, earlier and later, of an approaching revolution, which would affect not only the polity but the entire religious system of the mediæval Church.

I. Among these phenomena is to be mentioned the rise of anti-sacerdotal sects which sprang up as early as the eleventh century, but flourished chiefly in the twelfth and thirteenth. These indicated a widespread dissatisfaction with the worldliness of the clergy, and with prelatical government in the Church. There were individuals, like Peter of Bruys, himself a priest, and Henry the Deacon, a monk of Clugny, who, in the earlier part of the twelfth century, made a great disturbance in Southern France by vehement invectives against the immoralities of the priesthood and their usurped dominion. The simultaneous appearance of persons of this character, whose impassioned harangues won for them numerous adherents, shows that the popular reverence for the clergy was shaken. Conspicuous among the sectaries of this period are the Catharists, who were found in several countries, but were most numerous in the cities of North Italy and of the south of France. The dualism of the ancient Manicheans and of the later Paulicians — the theory that the empire of the world is divided between two antagonistic principles — together with the asceticism that grows out of it, reappears in a group of sects, which wear different names in the various regions where they are found.[1] They are characterized

[1] Upon the origin and mutual relation of these sects, their tenets, and their relation to the earlier dualistic heresies, see Neander, *Church History*, iv. 552 seq.; Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, III. iii. 7, § 87; Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, v. 156 seq.; Baur, *Kirchengeschichte*, iii. 489 seq.; Schmidt, *Hist. et Doctrine de la Secte des Cathares* (Paris, 1849), and article "Katharer" in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie;* Hahn, *Geschichte d. Ketzer im Mittelalter*, i.; Maitland, *Facts and Documents illustrative of the History, etc., of the Albigenses and the Waldenses* (1832); also, *Eight Essays* (Lond. 1852). Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1890).

in common by a renunciation of the authority of the priesthood. In Southern France, where they acquired the name of Albigenses, they were well organized, and were protected by powerful laymen. The poems of the troubadours show to what extent the clergy had fallen into disrepute in this wealthy and flourishing district.[1] In the extensive, opulent, and most civilized portion of France, which formed the dominion of the Count of Toulouse, the old religion was virtually supplanted by the new sect. The Albigensian preachers, who mingled with their heterodox tenets a sincere zeal for purity of life, were heard with favor by all classes. The extirpation of this numerous and formidable sect was accomplished only through a bloody crusade, that was set on foot under the auspices of Innocent III., and was followed by the efforts of the Inquisition, which here had its beginning.[2] The Albigenses, in their opposition to the authority of ecclesiastical tradition and of the hierarchy, and in their rejection of pilgrimages and of certain practices, like the worship of saints and images, anticipated the Protestant doctrine; although in other respects their creed is even more at variance with the spirit of Protestantism than is that of their opponents. It is interesting to observe that at the moment when the Papacy appeared to be at the zenith of its power, a rebellion broke out, which could only be put down by a great exertion of military force, and by brutalities which have left an indelible stain upon those who instigated them.[3]

The Waldenses, a party not tainted with Manichean doctrine, and distinct from the Catharists, arose in 1170, under the lead of Peter Waldo, of Lyons. Finding themselves forbidden to preach in a simple manner, after the example of the Apostles, the "Poor Men of Lyons," as they were styled, made a stand against the exclusive right of the clergy to teach the Gospel. Although the Waldenses are not of so high antiquity as was often supposed, since they do not reach further back than Waldo,

[1] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, v. 164. See, also, p. 137.

[2] "It was a war," says Guizot, "between feudal France and municipal France." *History of Civilization*, lect. x.

[3] The distinguished Catholic theologian, Hefele, in the *Kirchen-Lexikon*, art. "Albigenses," endeavors to lessen the responsibility of the Pope and the ecclesiastical authorities for the Albigensian massacres. But this is possible only to a very limited extent. It was not until frightful atrocities had been committed, that an attempt was made to curb the ferocity which had been excited by the most urgent appeals.

and although they were far less enlightened as to doctrine than they became after they had been brought in contact with Protestantism, yet their attachment to the Scriptures, and their opposition to clerical usurpation and profligacy, entitle them to a place among the precursors of the Reformation.[1] Wherever they went, they kindled among the people the desire to read the Bible. The principal theater of their labors was Milan, and other places in the north of Italy and the south of France, where the hierarchy had a weaker hold on the people, and where many who were disgusted with the priesthood were likewise repelled by the obnoxious theology of the Catharists.

The departure of the Franciscans from the rule of poverty led the stricter party in that order to break off; and all efforts to heal the schism proved ineffectual. The Spirituals, as the stricter sect were called, in their zeal against ecclesiastical corruption did not spare the Roman Church; and they, especially the lay brethren among them, the Fratricelli, were delivered over to the Inquisition.

At the end of the twelfth century there were formed in the Netherlands societies of praying women, calling themselves Beguines, who led a life of devotion without monastic vows. Similar societies of men, who were called Beghards, were afterwards formed. Many of both classes, for the sake of protection, connected themselves with the Tertiaries of the monastic orders. Many, following the rule of poverty, became mendicants along the Rhine and perhaps, through the influence of the sect of the Free Spirit — a Pantheistic sect — adopted heretical opinions; so that the names Beguine and Beghard, outside of the Netherlands, became synonymous with heretic. A swarm of enthusiasts and fanatics, known by these appellations, cherished a sincere hostility to the corrupt administration of the Church.

The existence and the number of this species of sectaries, whom the Inquisition could not extirpate, and who, it should

[1] The principal works which have served to settle disputed points respecting the Waldenses are Dieckhoff, *Die Waldenser im Mittelalter* (1851); Herzog, *Die romanischen Waldenser* (1853). Herzog has brought forward new information in his article on the Waldenses in his *Real-Encyclopädie*. See, also, Comba, *History of the Waldenses of Italy* (1889). The discovery of the manuscript of the *Nobla Leyczon* rendered it highly probable that this poem was composed in the fifteenth century. That the Waldenses had no existence prior to Waldo, is conceded at present by competent scholars.

be observed, were mostly plain and unlearned people, prove that a profound dissatisfaction with the existing order of things, and a deep craving, mingled though it was with ignorance and superstition, for the restoration of a more simple and apostolic type of Christianity, had penetrated the lower orders of society. Formerly they who were offended by the wealth and worldly temper of the clergy, had found relief by retreating to the austerities of monastic life within the Church. But the monastic societies, each in its turn, as they grew older, fell into the luxurious ways from which their founders had been anxious to escape. Now, as we approach the epoch of the Reformation, we observe the tendency of this sort of disaffection to embody itself in sects which assume a questionable or openly inimical attitude towards the Church. Yet it is well that the ecclesiastical revolution was not left for them to accomplish, but was reserved for enlightened and sober-minded men, who would know how to build up as well as to destroy.

II. The Conservative Reformers, the champions of the liberal, episcopal, or Gallican, as contrasted with the papal, conception of the hierarchy; the leaders in the reforming councils, both by what these eminent men achieved and by what they failed to achieve, prepared the way for the great change from which they themselves would have recoiled in dismay. In carrying forward their battle they were led to expose with unsparing severity the errors and crimes, as well as the enormous usurpations of authority, with which the popes were chargeable. This could not but essentially lower the respect of men for the papal office itself. At the same time the discomfiture of these reformers, as far as their principal attempt is concerned, to reform the Church "in head and members," a discomfiture effected by the persistency and dexterity of the popes and their active adherents, could not fail to leave the impression on many minds that a more stringent remedy would have to be sought for the unbearable grievances under which the Church labored. It must not be forgotten, however, that Gerson, D'Ailly, and their compeers, were as firmly wedded to the doctrine of a priesthood in the Church, and to the traditional dogmatic system, as were their opponents. At Constance, the Paris theologians almost outstripped their papal antagonists in the violent treatment of Huss during the sessions of the Council, and in the alacrity with

which they condemned him and Jerome of Prague to the stake. It was a reformation of morals, not of doctrine, at which they aimed; the distribution, but not the destruction, of priestly authority.

III. But there were individuals before, and long before the time of Luther, who are appropriately called radical reformers; men who, in essential points, anticipated the Protestant movement. There were conspicuous efforts which, if they proved to a considerable extent abortive at the moment, left seed to ripen afterwards, and were the harbinger of more effectual measures Of all this class of reformers before the Reformation, John Wickliffe is the most remarkable.[1] Living in the midst of the fourteenth century, nearly a hundred and fifty years before Luther; not an obscure or illiterate man, but a trained theologian, a Professor at Oxford; not hiding his opinions, but proclaiming them with boldness; he, nevertheless, took the position not only of a Protestant, but, in many important particulars, of a Puritan. In his principal work he affirms that no writing, not even a papal decree, has any validity further than it is founded on the Holy Scriptures; he denies transubstantiation, and attributes the origin of this dogma to the substitution of a belief in papal declarations for belief in the Bible; he asserts that in the primitive Church there were but two sorts of clergy; doubts the Scriptural warrant for the rites of confirmation and extreme unction; would have all interference with civil affairs and temporal authority interdicted to the clergy; speaks against the necessity of auricular confession; avers that the exercise of the power to bind and loose is of no effect, save when it is conformed to the judgment of Christ; is opposed to the multiplied ranks of the clergy — popes, cardinals, patriarchs, monks, canons, and the rest; repudiates the doctrine of indulgences and supererogatory merits, the doctrine of the excellence of poverty, as that was held and as it lay at the foundation of the mendicant orders; and he sets himself against artificial church music, pictures in worship, consecration with the use of oil and salt,

[1] *Life and Sufferings of John Wicklif*, by J. Lewis (Oxford, 1820); *Life of Wicklif*, by Charles Webb Le Bas (1846); *John de Wycliffe, a Monograph*, by Robert Vaughan, D.D. (London, 1853); Weber, *Geschichte der akatholischen Kirchen u. Secten von Gross-Brittanien*, i. 62 seq.; Hardwick, *History of the Christian Church:* Middle Age, p. 402 seq. G. Lechler, *Johann von Wiclif* (1873); W. W. Capes, *The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, p. 109 seq. (1900).

canonization, pilgrimages, church asylums for criminals, celibacy of the clergy.[1] Almost every distinguishing feature of the mediæval and papal church, as contrasted with the Protestant, is directly disowned and combated by Wickliffe. How was it possible that he could do this so long, in that age, with comparative impunity, and die at last in his bed, when so many whom he immeasurably outstripped in his reformatory ideas paid for their dissent with their lives? The reason is found partly in the fact that he identified himself with the University of Oxford, and with the secular or parish clergy in their struggle against the aspiring mendicant orders, and still more in the fact that he stood forth in the character of a champion of civil and kingly authority, against ecclesiastical encroachments. He was protected by Edward III., whose cause against papal tyranny he had supported; and after Edward's death, by powerful nobles. He was strong enough to withstand the opposition to his work of translating the Bible, and publicly to defend the right of the people to have the Scriptures in their own tongue. Not until the reign of Henry V., when the relation of the kings to the clergy was changed, was the persecution of the Wickliffites, or Lollards, as they were called, vigorously undertaken. They were not exterminated; but the principles of Wickliffe continued to have adherents in the poor and obscure classes in England, down to the outbreaking of the Protestant movement. It is remarkable that Wickliffe predicted that among the monks themselves there would arise persons who would abandon their false interpretations of Christianity, and, returning to the original religion of Christ, would build up the Church in the spirit of Paul.[2]

In the same rank with Wickliffe stands the name of John Huss.[3] Before him in Bohemia there had appeared Militz and

[1] Large extracts from the *Trialogus* are in Gieseler, III. iv. 8. § 125, n. 1. An analysis of it is given in Turner, *History of England*, v.

[2] The following passage is from the *Trialogus:* "Suppono autem quod aliqui fratres, quos Deus docere dignatur, ad religionem primævam Christi devotius convertentur, et relicta sua perfidia, sive obtenta sive petita Antichristi licentia, redibunt libere ad religionem Christi primævam, et tunc ædificabunt ecclesiam sicut Paulus." See Neander, v. 172.

[3] *Historia et Monumenta Jo. Hus et Hieron. Pragensis* (1715); Palacky, *Documenta Magistri J. Hus*, and the *Geschichte Böhmens* by the same author; Neander, *Church History*, v. 235 seq.; Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss* (1871); the works of Van der Hardt and Lenfant upon the Council of Constance; L. Krummel, *Geschichte d. Böhmisch. Reformat. im XV. Jahrh.* (1866); Wessenberg, *Die grossen Kirchenversammlungen des XV. u. XVI. Jahrh.* (vol. ii. 1840); Czerwenka, *Gsch. der Evang. Kirche in Böhmen*, 2 vols. Leipzig, 1869–70.

Conrad of Waldhausen, preachers animated with the fiery zeal of prophets, and lifting up their voices, in the face of persecution, against the corruption of religion.[1] Still more was Huss indebted to Matthias of Janow, whose ideas respecting the Church and the relations of clergy to laity involved the germs of changes more radical than he himself perceived. Huss was strongly influenced, likewise, by the writings of Wickliffe, and was active in disseminating them. The Bohemian reformer had less theological acumen than the English, with whom he agreed in his advocacy of philosophical realism and predestination; nor did he go so far on the road of doctrinal innovation; since Huss, to the last, was a believer in transubstantiation. But in his conception of the functions and duties of the clergy, in his zeal for practical holiness, and in his exaltation of the Scriptures above the dogmas and ordinances of the Church, in moral excellence and heroism of character, Huss was outdone by none of the reformers before or since. Luther, when he was a monk, accidentally fell upon a volume of the sermons of Huss, in the convent library of Erfurt, and was struck with wonder that the author of such sentiments as they contained should have been put to death for heresy. In the attitude which Huss assumed before the Council of Constance, there was involved the assertion of one of the distinctive principles of Protestantism — that of the right of private judgment. He was commanded to retract his avowals of opinion, and this he refused to do until he could be convinced by argument and by citations from Scripture that his opinions were erroneous. That is, he went behind the authority of the Council. This itself, in their eyes, amounted to flagrant heresy, and was sufficient to condemn him. It was a repudiation, on his side, of the principle of Church authority, which was a vital part of the ecclesiastical system. The cruel execution of Huss (1415) and of Jerome, especially as the former had rested on the Emperor's safe-conduct, excited a storm of wrath among their countrymen and adherents.[2] Bohemia was long the theater of violent agitation

[1] Neander, v. 173 seq.; Jordan, *Vorläufer des Hussitenthums in Böhmen* (Leipzig, 1846).

[2] That there was no violation of the safe-conduct is assumed by Palacky, *Gesch. Böhmens*, and is maintained by Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vii. For a review of Hefele and a discussion of this point, see *New Englander*, April, 1870. One of the principal offenses of Huss, in the eyes of the Council and of many

and of civil war. Repeated crusades were undertaken against the Hussites, but resulted in the defeat of the assailants. More pacific measures, coupled with internal conflicts in their own body, finally reduced their strength and left them a prey to their persecutors; but the Bohemian brethren, an offshoot from the more radical of the Hussite parties, continued to exist in separation from the Church; and in their confessions, drawn up at the beginning of the sixteenth century, they reject transubstantiation, purgatory, and the worship of saints.

Other names exist, less renowned than those of Wickliffe and Huss, but equally deserving to be inscribed among the heralds of the Reformation. Among them is John Wessel, who was connected at different times with the Universities of Cologne, Louvain, Paris, and Heidelberg, as a teacher of theology, and died in 1489.[1] He set forth in explicit and emphatic language the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Against the alleged infallibility of bishops and pontiffs, he avers that many of the greatest popes have fallen into pestilent errors both of doctrine and practice; giving as examples, Benedict XIII., Boniface IX., John XXIII., Pius II., and Sixtus IV. It has been said that there is scarcely a fundamental tenet of the reformers which Wessel did not avow. Luther, in his preface to a collection of several of Wessel's treatises, declares him to have been a man of admirable genius, a rare and great soul, and so far in accord with him as to doctrine, that if he had read sooner the words of Wessel, it might have been plausibly said by his enemies that he had borrowed everything from them.

A man whose doctrinal position was far less diverse from

writers since, was the doctrine, imputed to him, that prelates and magistrates separated from Christ by mortal sin, really cease to be invested with their offices. This was thought to strike at the foundations of all civil and ecclesiastical authority. But Huss explained to the Council that, in his view, such persons are still to be recognized *quoad officium*, though not *quoad meritum*. They are destitute of the ethical character that forms the moral essence of the office, though still exercising its functions. See, on this important question, Palacky, III. i. 353; Krummel, p. 519; Wessenburg, ii. 171; also, Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, VII. i. 163. To Wickliffe were imputed similar opinions. Only those in a state of grace, he held, can possess property; others may *occupy* but not *have*.— Gieseler, III. iv. c. viii. § 125, n. 18; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xxxiv. 536.

[1] The career of Wessel and his principles are fully described by Ullmann, vol. ii. pp. 287–642. For the reformatory opinions of John of Goch and John of Wessel, see Ullmann, and Gieseler, III. v. 5, § 153.

the current system, but who must be ranked among the noted precursors of the Reformation, is Savonarola.[1] From 1489 to his death in 1498, he lived at Florence, and for a while, by the force of his intellectual and moral character, and by his commanding eloquence, exerted a ruling influence in the affairs of the city. He was largely instrumental in the expulsion of the house of Medici from Florence. Against their tyranny and the immoralities which they fostered he directed from the pulpit his sharp invectives. On the invasion of the French under Charles VIII., which Savonarola had predicted, he was able, through the personal respect, amounting to awe, with which he inspired the king, to render important services to Florence. His position there resembled that which Calvin long maintained at Geneva. A Dominican, stimulated to stricter asceticism by the demoralized condition of the Church and of society, he poured out his rebukes without stint, until the political and religious elements that were combined against him, effected his destruction.[2] He had pronounced the excommunication, which was issued against him by the flagitious Alexander VI., void, had declared that it was from the devil, and he had continued to preach against the papal prohibition. In prison he composed a tract upon the fifty-first psalm, in which he comes so near the Protestant views of justification that Luther published it with a laudatory preface. Savonarola

[1] The two principal German biographies of Savonarola are by Rudelbach (Hamburg, 1835) and Meier (Berlin, 1836), the former of which treats principally of Savonarola's doctrine, the latter of the events of his career. From the French we have *Jérome Savonarola, sa Vie, ses Prédications, ses Écrits, par F. T. Perrens* (Paris, 1853). An extremely valuable life of Savonarola is that by Villari— *La Storia de Girolamo Savonarola e de' suoi tempi, narrata da Pasquale Villari con l'aiuto di nuovi documenti* (Firenze, 1859). Villari, in his *Prefazione,* criticises the previous biographers, including the English work by Madden. He considers that Rudelbach and others have exaggerated the Protestant tendencies of the great Dominican; that he adhered substantially to the dogmatic system of the Church, though hostile to papal absolutism. Villari vindicates him against the common imputation of a demagogical temper and exhibits him as a thorough patriot. He also shows that Savonarola's vacillation under torture was only in reference to the *source* of his prophecies, whether natural or supernatural; a point on which he had cherished no uniform conviction. An instructive and brilliant article by Milman (written prior to the publication of Villari's Life) appeared in the *Quarterly Review* (1859). See, also, E. Armstrong, in *Cambridge Modern History,* i. 144 seq. *Romola,* by George Eliot (Mrs. Lewes), one of the most remarkable novels of the recent times, presents a striking picture of Savonarola and of Florentine life in his time.

[2] For an example of his denunciation of the venality and other sins of the clergy, see Villari, ii. 80: "Vendono i benefizi, vendono i sacramenti, vendono le messe dei matrimonii, vendono ogni cosa," etc.

did not despair of the cause for which he laid down his life, but predicted a coming Reformation.

IV. We turn now to another class of men who powerfully, though indirectly, paved the way for the Protestant Revolution — the Mystics.[1]

Mysticism had developed itself all through the scholastic period, in individuals of profound religious feeling, to whom the exclusively dialectical tendency was repugnant. Such men were St. Bernard, Bonaventura, and the school of St. Victor. Anselm himself, the father of the schoolmen, mingled with his logical habit a mystical vein, and this combination was in fact characteristic of the best of the scholastic theologians. But with the decline of scholasticism, partly as a cause and partly as an effect, mysticism assumed a more distinct shape. The characteristic of the Mystics is the life of feeling; the preference of intuition to logic, the quest for knowledge through light imparted to feeling rather than by processes of the intellect; the indwelling of God in the soul, elevated to a holy calm by the consciousness of His presence; absolute self-renunciation and the absorption of the human will into the divine; the ecstatic mood. The theory of the Mystic may easily slide into pantheism, where the union of the human spirit with the divine is resolved into the identification of the two.[2] This tendency is perceptible in one class of the ante-Protestant Mystics, of which Master Eckart is a prominent representative. He was Provincial of the Dominicans for Saxony; the scene of his labors was in the neighborhood of the Rhine, and he died about 1329. Affiliated societies calling themselves the Friends of God, although they formed no sect, grew up in the south and west of Germany and in the Netherlands. They made religion center in a calm devoutness, in disinterested love to God and in labors of benevolence. It was in Cologne, Strasburg, and in other places in the neighborhood of the Rhine, that the preachers of this class chiefly flourished. Of them the most eminent is John Tauler (1290–

[1] Upon the Mystics, besides Ullmann's work, *Die Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, and Neander, v. 380 seq., see C. Schmidt, *Études sur le Mysticisms Allemand au XIV. siècle* (1847); Helfferich, *Die christl. Mystik* (1842); Noack, *Gesch. d. Mystik* (1853); R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics* (1856).

[2] On the nature of mysticism, see Ritter, *Gesch. d. christl. Philosophie*, iv. 626 seq. Ritter explains especially the ideas of Gerson. See, also, Hase, *Hutterus Redivivus*.

1361), Doctor sublimis et illuminatus, as he was styled, a pupil of Eckart, but an opposer of pantheism and a preacher of evangelical fervor.[1] To him Luther erroneously ascribed the little book which emanated from some member of this mystical school, called "The German Theology," a book which Luther published anew in 1516, and from which he said that, next to the Bible and St. Augustine, he had learned more than from any other book of what God, Christ, man, and all things are. The Mystics were eagerly heard by thousands who yearned for a more vital kind of religion than the Church had afforded them. The "Imitation of Christ," by Thomas à Kempis, a work which has probably had a larger circulation than any other except the Bible, is a fine example of the characteristic spirit of the mystical school.[2] The reformatory effect of the Mystics was twofold: they weakened the influence of the scholastic system and called men away from a dogmatic religion to something more inward and spiritual; and their labors, likewise, tended to break up the excessive esteem of outward sacraments and ceremonies. Standing within the Church and making no quarrel with it, they were thus preparing the ground, especially in Germany, through the whole of the fourteenth century, for the Protestant reform. With these pioneers of reform, and not with men like Huss and Wickliffe, the religious training of Luther and his great movement have a direct historical connection.

In speaking of the causes leading to the Reformation, it is natural to associate with this term the renouncing of papal authority or of one or more of the dogmas in the creed of the Church of Rome. It must be remembered, however, and has been already discerned, that social movements characteristic of the Renaissance period had sometimes partakers in them, often not a few, who did not waver in their professed fealty to the Roman See. Due credit must be given to individuals or associations of this class for everything meritorious in aim or influence. Numerous sincere Mystics were trained at Deventer, the School of the Brothers of Common Life. Among

[1] C. Schmidt, *Johannes Tauler von Strasburg* (1841); *Life of Tauler, with Twenty-five of his Sermons*, translated from the German by Susanna Winkworth, to which are added a preface by Rev. C. Kingsley, and an introduction by Rev. R. D. Hitchcock, D.D. (New York, 1858).

[2] Upon the authorship of this work, see Gieseler, III. v. 4. § 146; Ullmann, ii. 711 seq.; Schmidt in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*

those taught there, if Erasmus was the foremost man of genius, he was far from being the sole man of note who had been a pupil there. It was an earnest preacher, Gerard Groot, by whom the first steps were taken in its origin.[1] He collected about him a group of young men who looked forward to the attainment of the spiritual attainments requisite for ecclesiastic office. Pious laymen were permitted to join them. Like gatherings in the Netherlands and North Germany made it a principal aim to educate the people and to promote spiritual religion among devout monks and clergy. They likewise engaged in copying manuscripts of Scriptures and of the Fathers. They were concerned in promoting the study of antiquity and, in general, to increase and diffuse religious knowledge. For Christian sisters as well as for males houses were established. In their houses and schools they made it their aim to cultivate a true piety after their own ideal. The Brethren were signally successful in their disinterested, spiritual exertions.

A new era in the intellectual life of Germany was attendant on Gutenberg's use of the printing press and movable types (about 1450) — a new era, in fact, in all Christendom. Coincident with the rise of this new period is the career of Cardinal Nicholas Cues, — or Cusanus, whose family name was Krebs, — more honored for his life and labors, especially by his fellow-churchmen, than any other of the class reformers adhering to the Papal See of whom we have spoken.[2] Cues, a place near Treves, was his birthplace. Hence the name "Nicholas Cusanus."

He died in 1464. After leaving the Brothers' House at Deventer, he began the study of law at Padua, which he gave up to take up the study of theology. He became an Archdeacon, and took part in the Council of Basel, where at first, both orally

[1] The history and characteristics of the Brethren of Common Life are fully set forth in Hauck's *Realencyklopädie für Theologié u. Kirche*, vol. iii. p. 472 sqq. Briefer sketches are given, *e.g.* in Kurtz. *Kirchengest.*, vol. i. § 113, 9. Müller, *Kirchengest.*, B and II, 2d Heft. Müller, *History of the Church*, Engl. transl., *Middle Ages*, pp. 409 sqq., 538.

[2] A full account of Cusanus may be read in the work of Johannes Janssen, *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages*, English translation, 2 vols. (1897). In connection with Janssen's history of this period, the critical review of it by Protestant authors are entitled to attention, especially Köstlin. See, also, "Cambridge Modern History," vol. i. *The Renaissance*, p. 628 seq. The account of Cusanus, given by Pastor in his *History of the Popes* in the Renaissance, is by a Roman Catholic author of merit.

and in writing, he advocated the view that the Council takes rank above the Pope, but later he adopted the opposite view. On account of his erudition, his cleverness, and rhetorical gift, he was employed by Pope Eugene IV. in diplomatic missions and other transactions, and in the successful sale of Indulgences in Germany for the rebuilding of St. Peter's Church. In 1448 he was made by Eugene a Cardinal. He was held in honor for his virtues as a priest. For years he traveled as an apostle and an industrious reformer, reviving ecclesiastical discipline, preaching to the clergy and people, promoting education among both classes. He pursued his aims by holding councils and synods in great number. He framed rules for the inspection of monasteries. It is undeniable that he was bent on promoting the cause of practical reform of the whole Church. At the same time he made no attempt to modify its organic structure. He was warmly interested in humanistic studies, and not less so in mathematics and in natural science. He was fond of classical studies. In Italy he was untiring in the study of Plato and Aristotle. He had been appointed by the Pope Bishop of Brixen and encountered serious difficulties by extending reforms of which there was urgent need. His principal work was a noted treatise in three volumes, "de docta ignorantia," in which leading scholastic metaphysical theories are discussed. He wrote, prompted by the fall of Constantinople, his "Dialogue on Peace or Concord of Faith," in behalf of religious tolerance. Christianity, he treated as the most perfect of all religions, but held that in all the other religions, including Mohammedanism, likewise essential elements of eternal truth are to be recognized. His metaphysical turn and his relish of the teaching of Master Eckart imparted to some of his writings a decided Pantheistic tinge, which has led him to be styled a speculative Copernicus, and was not without its impression later on Giordano Bruno, who was imprisoned at Rome and in 1600 was burned at the stake.

V. An event of signal importance, as an indispensable prerequisite and means of a reformation in religion, was the revival of learning. This great intellectual change emanated from Italy as its fountain. During the Middle Ages, in the midst of prevailing darkness and disorder, Italy never wholly lost the traces of ancient civilization. "The night which descended upon her was the night of an Arctic summer. The dawn began to reap-

pear before the last reflection of the preceding sunset had faded from the horizon." [1] The three great writers, Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, introduced a new era of culture. To the long neglect which the classic authors had suffered, Dante refers, when he says of Virgil that he

"Seemed from long-continued silence hoarse."[2]

The mind of Italy more and more turned back upon its ancient history and literature. The study of the Roman classics became a passion. No pains and no expense were spared in recovering manuscripts and in collecting libraries. Princes became the personal cultivators and profuse patrons of learning. The same zeal extended itself to Greek literature. The philosophers and poets of antiquity were once more read with delight in their own tongues. The capture of Constantinople by the Turks, in 1453, brought a throng of Greek scholars, with their invaluable literary treasures, to Italy, and gave a fresh impulse to the new studies. From Italy, the same literary spirit spread over the other countries of Europe. The humanities — grammar, rhetoric, poetry, eloquence, the classical authors — attracted the attention of the studious everywhere.

"Other futures stir the world's great heart,
Europe is come to her majority,
And enters on the vast inheritance
Won from the tombs of mighty ancestors,
The seeds, the gold, the gems, the silent harps
That lay deep buried with the memories of old renown."

. . . . . .

"For now the old epic voices ring again,
And vibrate with the heat and melody,
Stirred by the warmth of old Ionian days.
The martyred sage, the attic orator,
Immutably incarnate, like the gods,
In spiritual bodies, winged words,
Holding a universe impalpable,
Find a new audience."[3]

This movement brought with it momentous consequences in the field of religion. It marked the advent of a new stage of culture, when the Church was no longer to be the sole instructor; when a wider horizon was to be opened to the human intellect — an effect analogous to that soon to be produced by the grand

[1] Macaulay, *Essay on Macchiavelli. Essays*, i. (New York, 1861).
[2] *Inf.*, i. 63. "Chi per lungo silenzio parea fioco."
[3] George Eliot's *Spanish Gypsy*, pp. 5, 6.

geographical discovery of a new hemisphere. Christianity was to come into contact with the products of the intellect of the ancient nations, and to assimilate whatever might not be alien to its own nature.

For several hundred years the Scholastic philosophy and theology had reigned with an almost undisputed sway. When the Schoolmen arose with their methods of logical analysis and disputation, the old compilations or books of excerpts from the Fathers, out of which theology, for a number of centuries, had been studied, quickly became obsolete, and the adherents of the former method were utterly eclipsed by the attractiveness of the new science. Young men by thousands flocked after the new teachers. From about the middle of the eleventh century Scholasticism had been dominant. Nor was this era without fruit. As a discipline for the intellect of semi-civilized peoples; as a counterpoise to the tendencies to enthusiasm and superstition which were rife in the Middle Ages; as a means of reducing to a regular and tangible form the creed of the Church, so that it could be examined and judged, the scholastic training and the intellectual products of it were of high value.[1] But the narrowness and other gross defects of the scholastic culture were laid bare by the incoming of the new studies. The barbarous style and the whole method of the Schoolmen became obnoxious and ridiculous in the eyes of the devotees of classical learning. The extravagant hair-splitting of Scotus and Durandus, when compared with the nobler method of the philosophers of antiquity, excited disdain. The works of Aristotle, which were now possessed in their own language, exposed blunders in the translation and interpretation of him, which brought disgrace upon the Schoolmen. Their ignorance of history, their uncritical habit, their overdrawn subtlety and endless wrangling, made them objects of derision; and as the Schoolmen had once supplanted the Compilers, so now the race of syllogistic reasoners were, in their turn, laughed off the stage by the new generation of classical scholars.

But the fall of Scholasticism did not take place until it had run its course and lost its vitality. The essential principle of the Schoolmen was the correspondence of faith and reason; the characteristic aim was the vindication of the contents of

[1] Gieseler, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 472 seq.

faith, the articles of the creed, on grounds of reason. This continued to be the character of Scholasticism, although the successors of Anselm did not, like him, aspire to establish the positive truths of Christianity by arguments independent of revelation. "Fides quærit intellectum" was ever the motto. There were individuals, as Abelard in the twelfth century, and Roger Bacon in the thirteenth, who seem restive under the yoke of authority, but who really differ from their contemporaries rather in the tone of their mind than in their theological tenets. Scholasticism, when it gave up the attempt to verify to the intelligence what faith received on the authority of the Church, confessed its own failure. This transition was made by Duns Scotus. It was Occam, the pupil of Scotus, by whom the change was consummated. He was the leading agent in reviving Nominalism. Although both Wickliffe and Huss were Realists, it was Nominalism that brought Scholasticism to an end. In giving only a subjective validity to general notions and to reasonings founded on them, in seeking to show that no settled conclusions can be reached on the path of rational inquiry and argument, and in leaving no other warrant for Church dogmas except that of authority, a foundation was laid for skepticism. The way was paved for the principle which found a distinct expression in the fifteenth century, that a thing may be true in theology and false in philosophy. Occam was a sturdy opponent of the temporal power of the popes, a defender of the independence of the civil authority as related to them. When he suggests propositions at variance with orthodoxy and argues for them, he saves himself from the imputation of heresy by professing an absolute submission to authority; but it is difficult to believe these professions perfectly sincere. Nominalism necessarily tended to encourage, also, an empirical method, an attention to the facts of nature and of inner experience, in the room of the logical fabric which had been subverted. The scholastic philosophy, when it came to affirm the dissonance of reason and the creed, dug its own grave.[1] It may be mentioned here that Luther in his youth was a diligent student of Occam. From Occam he derived

[1] On Occam, see Baur, *Dogmengeschichte*, ii. 236 seq.; Dorner, *Entwickelungsgsch. von der Person Christi*, ii. 447 seq.; Ritter, *Gsch. d. christl. Phil.*, iv. 574 seq.; Haureau, *De la Phil. Scholastique*, t. ii.; Hauck, *Realencyklopädie*, art. "Occam."

defenses, as to another Nominalist, D'Ailly, he owed the suggestion, of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper.[1]

But other effects of a more positive character than the downfall of Scholasticism flowed from the renovation of learning. The Fathers were brought out of their obscurity, and their teachings might be compared with the dogmatic system which professed to be founded upon them, but which had really, in its passage through the mediæval period, taken on features wholly unknown to the patristic age. More than this, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, the primitive documents of the Christian religion, were brought forward in the original tongues, to serve as a touchstone by which the prevailing doctrinal and ecclesiastical system must be tested. The newly invented art of printing, an art which almost immediately attained a high degree of perfection, in connection with the hardly less important manufacture of paper from linen, stimulated, at the same time that it fed, the appetite for literature. It is evident that the freshly awakened thirst for knowledge, with the abundant means for gratifying it, must produce a widespread ferment. A movement had begun, in the presence of which Latin Christianity, that vast fabric of piety and superstition, of reason and imagination, would not be left undisturbed.

From the beginning of the humanistic revival, it assumed, north of the Alps, especially in Germany, characteristics different from those which pertained to it in Italy. In Italy the Humanists were so smitten with antiquity, so captivated with ancient thought, as to look with indifference and, very frequently, with a secret skepticism, upon Christianity and the Church.[2] Even an Epicurean infidelity as to the foundations of religion, which was caught from Lucretius and from the dialogues of Cicero, infected a wide circle of literary men. Preachers, in a strain of florid rhetoric, would associate the names of Greek and Roman heroes with those of apostles and saints, and with the name of the Saviour himself. If an example of distinguished piety was required, reference would be made to Numa Pompilius. So prevalent was disbelief respecting the fundamental truths of natural religion that the Council of the Lateran, under

[1] Rettberg, *Occam und Luther, Studien u. Kritiken*, 1831, 1. Dorner, ii. 607. "Diu multumque legit scripta Occam. Hujus acumen anteferebat Thomæ et Scoto." Melancthon. *Vita Lutheri*, v.

[2] Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung d. classischen Alterthums*, p. 475 seq.

Leo X., felt called upon to affirm the immortality and individuality of the soul. The revival of literature in Italy was thus, to a considerable degree, the revival of paganism. When we look at the poets and rhetoricians, we should suppose that the gods of the old mythology had risen from the dead, while in the minds of thinking men Plato and Plotinus had supplanted Paul and Isaiah. If in the Florentine school of Platonists, under the lead of Marsilius Ficinus, a more believing temper prevailed, yet these mingled freely with Christian tenets fancies borrowed from the favorite philosophy. It is not meant that religion was driven out by humanism. The spirit of religion had vanished to a great extent before, and Humanism took possession of vacant ground. Under the influence of the classic school, says Guizot, the Church in Italy "gave herself up to all the pleasures of an indolent, elegant, licentious civilization, to a taste for letters, the arts, and social and physical enjoyments. Look at the way in which the men who played the greatest political and literary parts at that period passed their lives — Cardinal Bembo, for example — and you will be surprised by the mixture which it exhibits of luxurious effeminacy and intellectual culture, of enervated manners and mental vigor. In surveying this period, indeed, when we look at the state of opinions and of social relations, we might imagine ourselves living among the French of the eighteenth century. There was the same desire for the progress of intelligence, and for the acquirement of new ideas; the same taste for an agreeable and easy life, the same luxury, the same licentiousness; there was the same want of political energy and of moral principles, combined with singular sincerity and activity of mind. The literati of the fifteenth century stood in the same relation to the prelates of the Church as the men of letters and philosophers of the eighteenth did to the nobility. They had the same opinions and manners, lived agreeably together, and gave themselves no uneasiness about the storms that were brewing round them. The prelates of the fifteenth century, and Cardinal Bembo among the rest, no more foresaw Luther and Calvin than the courtiers of Louis XIV. foresaw the French Revolution. The analogy between the two cases is striking and instructive." [1]

The semi-pagan spirit was not confined to elegant literature.

[1] Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization*, lect. xi.

It entered the sphere of politics and practical morals, and in this department found a systematic expression in "The Prince" of Macchiavelli. This work, which was intended neither as a satire, nor as an exposure of king-craft for the warning of the people, but as a serious code of political maxims, sets at defiance the principles of Christian morality. The only apology that can be made for it is that it simply reflects the actual practice of that age, the habitual conduct of rulers, in which treachery and dissimulation were accounted a merit.[1] Macchiavelli was a patriot, he was at heart a republican, but he seems to have concluded that Italy had no hope save in a despot, and that all means are justifiable which are requisite or advantageous for securing an end. Yet he was supported and held in esteem by Leo X. and Clement VII., and inscribed his flagitious treatise to young Lorenzo de Medici. The political condition of Italy favored the growth of a public opinion, in which the vices recommended in "The Prince" were looked upon not only without disapprobation, but as commendable qualities in a statesman.

In Germany, on the contrary, from the outset, the new learning was cultivated in a religious spirit. It kindled the desire to examine the writings of the Fathers and to study earnestly the Scriptures. Reuchlin, the recognized leader of the German Humanists, considered that his greatest work, his most durable monument, was his Hebrew Grammar. His battle with the monks is a decisive event in the combat of the new era with the old. Reuchlin had studied Greek at Paris and Basel; he had lectured in various schools and universities; had been employed in important offices by princes; had visited Rome on official business; at Florence had mingled with Politian, Pico de Mirandola, Marsilius Ficinus; had devoted himself enthusiastically to the study of Hebrew, not only as the language of the Scriptures, but also because he supposed himself to find in the Kabbala corroboration and illustration of Christian doctrines. He was everywhere famous as a scholar. The Dominicans of Cologne, with Hoogstraten, an ignorant prior, at their head, vexed at Reuchlin's refusal to support them in their project for destroying Judaism by burning all the Hebrew literature except

[1] See the remarks of Wheaton, *Elements of International Law*, i. pp. 18, 19.
[2] See Macaulay's Essay, *Macchiavelli*. L. A. Burd, in *Cambridge Modern History*, i. 190 seq.

the Old Testament — a project to which they had been incited by Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew — put forth a resolute and malignant effort to get him convicted of heresy or force him to retract his published opinions. Finding that soft words and reasonable concessions were unavailing, he took up the contest in right earnest, and, being supported by the whole Humanist party, which rallied in defense of their chief, he at length succeeded, though not without passing through much anxiety and peril, in achieving a victory. By it the scale was turned against the adversaries of literature. The scholars vanquished the monks. In this conflict Reuchlin was efficiently aided by Francis of Sickingen and Ulrich von Hutten, both of them quite disposed, if it were necessary, to make use of carnal weapons against the hostile ecclesiastics. It was the alliance of the knights with the pioneers of learning. The *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, composed by Hutten and others, are a scornful satire upon the ignorance, bigotry, and intolerance of Hoogstraten and the monks.[1] The applause that greeted the appearance of these letters, in which the monks are held up to merciless ridicule, was a significant sign of the progress of intelligence (1516).

The Humanists were slow in gaining a foothold in the universities. These establishments in Germany had been founded on the model of Paris. Theology had the uppermost seat, and the scholastic philosophy was enthroned in the chairs of instruction. In particular, Paris and Cologne were the strongholds of the traditional theology. The Humanists at length gained admission for their studies at Heidelberg, Tübingen, and some other places. In 1502, the Elector Frederic of Saxony organized the university at Wittenberg. This new institution, which declared Augustine to be its patron saint, was from the first favorable to Biblical studies, and gave a hospitable reception to the teachers of classical learning.[2] Here was to be the hearthstone of the Reformation.

In other countries the cause of learning was advancing, and brought with it increased liberality, and tendencies to reform in religion. In 1498, Colet, the son of a wealthy London merchant who had been Lord Mayor of the city, had returned from

[1] On this work see Baur, *Kirchengeschichte*, iv. 17, and Sir William Hamilton, *Discussions*, etc. (1853).

[2] Von Raumer, *Geschichte der Pädogogik*, iv. 34.

his studies in Italy, and was expounding the Greek epistles of Paul at Oxford, to the delight of all who aspired after the "new learning," and the disgust and alarm of the devotees of the scholastic theology. He was joined by Erasmus, then thirty years of age, of the same age as Colet, and not yet risen to fame, but full of ardor in the pursuit of knowledge, and glad to enter into the closest bonds of friendship and fellowship with the more devout, if less brilliant and versatile, English scholar. To them was united a young man, Thomas More, who was destined to the law, but whose love of knowledge and sympathy with the advancing spirit of the age, brought him into intimate relations with the two scholars just named.[1] Colet, More, and Erasmus continued to be friends and fellow-laborers in a common cause to the end. Colet became Dean of St. Paul's, founded St. Paul's school at his own expense, and boldly, yet with gentleness, exerted his influence, not only in favor of classical and Biblical study, but also, not without peril to himself, against superstition and in behalf of enlightened views in religion. More followed the same path, and in his "Utopia" he has a chapter on the religions of that imaginary commonwealth, in which he represents that the people were debating among themselves "whether one that were chosen by them to be a priest, would not be thereby qualified to do all the things that belong to that character, even though he had no authority derived from the Pope." It was one of the ancient laws of the Utopians that no one should be punished for his religion, but converts were to be made to any faith only "by amicable and modest ways, without the use of reproaches or violence." They made confession, not to priests, but to the heads of families. Their worship was in temples, in which were no images, and where the forms of devotion were carefully framed in such a way as not to offend the feelings of any class of sincere worshipers. In this work, as in the sermons of Colet, even such as were preached before Henry VIII., there was a plain exposure of the barbarities and impolicy of war. In reference to what we term political and social science, there appear in the teachings of Colet and More, and of their still more famous associate, a humane spirit and a

[1] At Oxford, as at Paris and elsewhere, the adversaries of the "new learning" united in a hostility to the study of Greek. It reminds one of the antipathy to the same study which existed among the conservative Romans when Cicero was a youth. Forsyth, *Life of Cicero*, i. 20.

hostility to tyranny and to all oppressive legislation, which are not less consonant with the spirit of the Gospel, than they were in advance of the practice of the times.[1]

The foremost representative of Humanism, the incarnation, as it were, of its genius, was Erasmus.[2] The preëminence which he attained as a literary man is what no other scholar has approached, unless it be Voltaire, whom he resembled in the deference paid to him by the great in worldly rank. Each was a wit and an iconoclast in his own way, but their characters in other respects were quite unlike.[3] The fame of Erasmus was rendered possible, in part, by the universal use of Latin, as the common language of educated men; a state of things of which his want of familiarity with Italian and English, although he had sojourned in Italy and lived long in England, is a curious sign. By the irresistible bent of his mind, as well as by assiduous culture, Erasmus was a man of letters. He must be that, whatever else he failed to be. His knowledge of Greek was inferior to that of his contemporary and rival, Budæus; he took no pains to give his style a classical finish, and laughed at the pedantic Ciceronians, who avoided all phraseology not sanctioned by the best ancient authority, and sometimes all words not found in their favorite author.[4] He wrote hastily: "I precipitate," he says, "rather than compose."[5] Yet the wit and wisdom and varied erudition which he poured forth from his full mind, made him justly the most popular of writers. He sat on his throne, an object of admiration and of envy. By his multifarious publications and his wide correspondence with eminent persons, — ecclesiastics, statesmen, and scholars, — his

[1] The relations of Colet, More, and Erasmus, and the characteristic work of each, are finely described in the truly interesting work of Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers of 1498* (London, 1869).

[2] *Opera*, xi. vols., folio, etc. (Clericus) 1703. There are lives of Erasmus by Le Clerc, Bayle, Knight, Burigny (Paris, 1757), Jortin (1758–60), Hess (Zurich, 1790), Adolf Müller (1828), by Erhard in *Ersch und Gruber's Encyclopäd.* (xxxvi.), and by others; a sketch by Nisard in his *Études sur la Renaissance*. These biographies are criticised by Milman in his interesting article on Erasmus, *Quart. Rev.*, No. ccxi., reprinted in his *Essays*. Life by Drummond, 2 vols. (1873), J. A. Froude, Life and Letters (1895), Life by Emerton (1899). Notwithstanding the unfavorable judgment of Johnson, Jortin's Life is anything but a "dull book." For a scholar, notwithstanding its want of plan and of symmetry, it is one of the most delightful of biographies.

[3] Coleridge has compared and contrasted them, *The Friend*, First Landing Place: Essay i.

[4] Jortin, i. 152.

[5] *Ibid.*, i. 152.

influence was diffused over all Europe. In all the earlier part of his career Erasmus struggled with indigence. His health was not strong and he thought that he could not live upon a little. His dependence upon patronage and pensions placed fetters upon him, to some extent, to the end of his life; yet he loved independence, frequently chose to receive the attentions of the great at a distance from them, and selected for his place of abode the city of Basel, where he was free alike from secular and ecclesiastical tyranny. Erasmus, by his writings and his entire personal influence, was the foe of superstition. In his early days he had tasted, by constraint, something of monkish life, and his natural abhorrence of it was made more intense by this bitter recollection and by the trouble it cost him, after he had become famous, to release himself from the thraldom to which his former associates were inclined to call him back. In truth, he conducted a lifelong warfare against the monks and their ideas and practices. His "Praise of Folly" and, in particular, the "Colloquies," in which idleness, the illiteracy, self-indulgence, and artificial and useless austerities of "the religious," were handled in the most diverting style, were read with infinite amusement by all who sympathized with the new studies, and by thousands who did not calculate the effect of this telling satire in abating popular reverence for the Church. The "Praise of Folly" was written in 1510 or 1511, in More's house, for the amusement of his host and a few other friends. Folly is personified, and represented as discoursing to her followers on the affairs of mankind. All classes come in for their share of ridicule. Grammarians and pedagogues, in the fœtid atmosphere of their schoolrooms, bawling at their boys and beating them; scholastic theologians, wrangling upon frivolous and insoluble questions, and prating of the physical constitution of the world as if they had come down from a council of the gods — "with whom and whose conjectures nature is mightily amused;" monks, "the race of new Jews," who are surprised at last to find themselves among the goats, on the left hand of the Judge, faring worse than common sailors and wagoners; kings who forget their responsibilities, rob their subjects, and think only of their own pleasures, as hunting and the keeping of fine horses; popes who, though infirm old men, take the sword into their hands, and "turn law, religion, peace, and all human

affairs upside down" — such are some of the divisions of mankind who are held up to ridicule. At this time Julius II. filled the papal chair, and all readers of Erasmus must have recognized the portrait which he drew of the warlike old pontiff. Erasmus did not spare the legends of the saints, which formed so fair a mark for the shafts of wit; and by his observations on the stigmata of St. Francis, he offended the order of which he was the almost adored founder. When requested by a cardinal to draw up the lives of the Saints, he begged to be excused; they were too full of fables.[1] His comments on misgovernment in the Church, on the extortions and vices of the clergy, from the Pope downwards, were not the less biting and effective, for the humorous form in which they were generally cast. Indeed, as Coleridge has said, it is a merit of the jests of Erasmus that they can all be translated into arguments. There was what he called a "Pharisaic kingdom," and he would never write anything, he said, that would give aid and comfort to the defenders of it.[2] In his own mind, he distinguished between the Church and the "Popish sect," as he designated, even in a letter to Melancthon, the supporters of ecclesiastical abuses and tyranny.[3] There were, in his judgment, two evils that must be cut up by the roots before the Church could have peace. The one was hatred for the court of Rome, occasioned by her intolerable avarice and cruelty; the other was the yoke of human constitutions, robbing the people of their religious liberty. He would have made the creed a very short one, limited to a few "plain truths contained in Scripture," and leaving all the rest to the individual judgment. He thought that many things should be referred, not according to the popular cry, to "the next general council," but to the time when we see God face to face.[4] Partly from the natural kindness of his temper, partly from his liberal culture, and still more, perhaps, from a personal appreciation of the difficulties and uncertainties of religious doctrine, he went beyond almost every other eminent man of his age in his liking for religious liberty. He was conscious that without the practice of a pretty wide toleration on the part of rulers in Church and State, he would himself fare ill. He was, in fact, obliged to be constantly on the defense against charges

[1] Jortin, i. 294, ii. 34.
[2] *Ibid.*, i. 284.
[3] *Ibid.*, i. 313.
[4] *Ibid.*, i. 265.

of heresy. He had said things without number which could easily be turned into grounds of accusation. His enemies were numerous and vindictive, and although, in the literary combat, he was more than a match for all of them, he was sensitive to their attacks. He complains that the Spaniard, Stunica, had presented to Leo X. a libel against him, containing sixty thousand heresies extracted from his writings.[1] Notwithstanding all his denials and professions, there lurked in the minds of the ardent adherents of the mediæval system, an instinctive feeling that he was a dangerous enemy, and that his influence, so far as it prevailed, could only conduce to their overthrow. In this feeling, whatever may have been true of their specific charges, they were fully justified. Yet it is doubtful whether the condemnation of his "Colloquies" by the University of Paris, and other proceedings of a like nature, which emanated from the monkish party, did not operate to give to his ideas a wider currency.

But there was a positive work which Erasmus did, the solidity and value of which it is difficult to overestimate. By his editions of Cyprian and Jerome, and his translations from Origen, Athanasius, and Chrysostom, he opened up the knowledge of Christian antiquity, and gave his contemporaries access to a purer and more Biblical theology. His edition of the New Testament, his paraphrases of the New Testament, which were at one time appointed to be read in the churches of England, his commentaries, his treatise on preaching, and various other works, promoted Christian knowledge in a most remarkable degree. In his writings of this sort, along with enlightened views of doctrine and of the nature of the Christian life, were earnest complaints against the multitude of church ordinances contrived for the oppression of the poor and the enriching of the clergy. He would have the laity instructed; he wished that the humblest woman might read the Gospels. The judaizing customs and rites with which the Church was burdened, are pointed out in his comments on Scripture. In these publications, which the art of printing scattered in multiplied editions over Europe, the great lights of the patristic age, and the Apostles themselves, reappeared to break up the reign of superstition. Never was an alliance between author and printer more happy

[1] Jortin, i. 269.

for both parties, or more fruitful of good to the public, than was that between Erasmus and Froben of Basel. In view of the whole career and various productions of the Chief of the Humanists, it is not exaggerated praise to say that he was "the living embodiment of almost all that which, in consequence of the revival of the study of the ancients, the mind of the Western nations for more than a hundred years had wrought out and attained. It was not only a knowledge of languages, not only cultivation of style, of taste; but therewith the whole mental cast had received a freer turn, a finer touch. In this comprehensive sense, one may say that Erasmus was the most cultivated man of his times." [1]

Of the relations of Erasmus to Luther and the Protestant cause, there will be an occasion to speak hereafter. His writings and the reception accorded to them show that the European mind had outgrown the existing ecclesiastical system, and was ready to break loose from its control.

Some of the principal points of view which have been presented in this and in the preceding lecture, respecting the causes that paved the way of the Reformation, may be briefly set forth as follows: —

Among the salient features characteristic of the Middle Ages were: the subordination of civil to ecclesiastical society, of the State to the vast theocratical community having its center at Rome; the government of the Church by the clergy; the union of peoples under a common ecclesiastical law and a uniform Latin ritual; an intellectual activity shaped by the clergy and subservient to the prevailing religious and ecclesiastical system.

Among the symptoms of the rise of a new order of things were: —

1. The laical spirit; becoming alive to the rights and interests of civil society; developing in the towns a body of citizens bold to confront clerical authority, and with their practical understanding sharpened and invigorated by diversified industry and by commerce; a laical spirit which manifested itself, also, in the lower classes, in satires aimed at the vices of the clergy; which, likewise, gave rise to a more intense feeling of patriotism,

[1] Strauss, *Ulrich von Hutten* p. 481.

a new sense of the national bond, a new vigor in national churches.[1]

2. A conscious or unconscious religious opposition to the established system; an opposition which appeared in sects like the Waldenses, who brought forward the Bible as a means of correcting the teaching, rebuking the officers, or reforming the organization of the Church; or in Mystics who regarded religion as an inward life, an immediate relation of the individual to God, and preached fervently to the people in their own tongue.

3. A literary and scientific movement, following and displacing the method of culture that was peculiar to the mediæval age; a movement which enlarged the area and multiplied the subjects of thought and investigation; which drew inspiration and nutriment from the masterpieces of ancient wisdom, eloquence, and art.

These three latent or open species of antagonism to the mediæval spirit were often mingled with one another. The Mystic and the Humanist might be united in the same person. The laical spirit in its higher types of manifestation was reënforced by the new culture. Satirical attacks upon absurd ceremonies, upon the follies and sins of monks and priests, had a keener edge, as well as a more serious effect, when they emanated from students familiar with Plautus and Juvenal.

[1] See Hagen, *Deutschland's literarische u. religiöse Verhältnisse im Reformationszeitalter*, i. 1-32. But Hagen (p. 18) separates the "satyrisch volksmässige" opposition, as a distinct head, in the room of the more general rubric above. He does not omit to notice, however, the other elements involved in the lay spirit.

CHAPTER IV

LUTHER AND THE GERMAN REFORMATION, TO THE DIET OF AUGSBURG, 1530

GERMANY, including the Netherlands and Switzerland, was the center, the principal theater, of the Reformation. It is not without truth that the Germans claim, as the native characteristic of their race, a certain inwardness, or spirituality in the large sense of the term. This goes far to explain the hospitable reception which the Germanic tribes gave to Christianity, and the docility with which they embraced it.[1] They found in the Christian religion a congenial spirit. The German spirit of independence, or love of personal liberty, is a branch of this general habit of mind. Germany began its existence as a distinct nation in a successful resistance to the attempt of the clergy to dispose of the inheritance of Charlemagne.[2] It was the Germans who prevented his monarchy from being converted into an ecclesiastical State. On the field of Fontenay the forces of the Franks were separated into two hostile divisions, the one composed predominantly of the German element, which planted itself on the German traditional law for regulating the succession; the other of the Roman element that had the support of the ecclesiastics. Mysticism, the product of a craving for a religion of less show and more heart, had, as we have seen, its stronghold, in the latter part of the mediæval

[1] "Es war das Christenthum nichts was dem Deutschen fremd und widerwärtig gewesen wäre, vielmehr bekam der deutsche Charakter durch das Christenthum nur die Vollendung seiner selbst; er fand sich in der Kirche Christi selbst, nur gehoben, verklärt und geheiligt." Vilmar, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, p. 7. Tacitus says of the ancient Germans, that they conceived it unworthy of the gods to be confined within walls, or to be represented by images; and that the head of a family exercised a priestly function. *Germania*, cc. ix., x. Grimm finds in the descriptions of Tacitus the complete germ of Protestantism — "den vollen keim des Protestantismus." *Deutsche Mythologie*, p. xliii. For like views from a French writer, see Taine, *Art in the Netherlands*, pp. 32, 33, 64. The Saxons resisted the Gospel, because it was forced on them by a conqueror.

[2] Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, i. 10 seq.

period, in Germany. The triumph of the Papacy had been due to the division between the emperor and the great vassals, not to any deep-seated fondness for a foreign and ecclesiastical supremacy. It was natural that the Reformation, which was an uprising against clerical usurpation and in favor of a more inward and spiritual worship, should spring up in Germany. A German philosopher has dwelt with eloquence upon the fact that while the rest of the world had gone out to America, to the Indies, in quest of riches and to found an earthly empire encircling the globe, on which the sun should never set, a simple monk, turning away from the things of sense and empty forms, was finding Him whom the disciples had once sought for in a sepulcher of stone. Hegel attributes the inception and success of the Reformation to this "ancient and constantly preserved inwardness of the German people," in consequence of which they are not content to approach God by proxy, or put their religion outside of them, in sacraments and ceremonies, in sensuous, imposing spectacles.[1] A German historian has made substantially the same assertion respecting the genius of the German people: "One peculiar characteristic for which the German race has ever been distinguished is their profound sense of the religious element, seated in the inmost depths of the soul; their readiness to be impelled by the discordant strifes of the external world and unfruitful human ordinances, to seek and find God in the deep recesses of their own hearts, and to experience a hidden life in God springing forth in opposition to barren conceptions of the abstract intellect that leave the heart cold and dead, a mechanism that converts religion into a round of outward ceremonies." [2]

Unquestionably the hero of the Reformation was Luther. Without him and his powerful influence, other reformatory movements, even such as had an independent beginning, like that of Zwingli, might have failed of success. As far as we can judge, they would have produced no widespread commotion as to lead to enduring results. It has been said, with truth, of Luther, that "his whole life and character, his heart and soul and mind, are identified and one with his great work, in a manner very different from what we see in other men. Melancthon,

[1] Hegel, *Phil. der Geschichte; Werke*, ix. 499 seq.
[2] Neander, v. 81.

for instance, may easily be conceived apart from the Reformation, as an eminent divine, living in other ages, of the Church, as the friend of Augustine or the companion of Fénelon. Even Calvin may be separated in thought from the age of the Reformation, and may be set among the Schoolmen, or in the council chamber of Hildebrand or of Innocent, or at the Synod of Dort, or among Cromwell's chaplains." "But Luther apart from the Reformation would cease to be Luther." [1]

He was born in 1483, at the very time when Columbus was struggling to obtain the means of prosecuting that voyage which resulted in the discovery of a new world.[2] It is a marked historical coincidence, which has more than once been pointed out, that the reform of the Christian religion should be simultaneous with the opening of new regions of the globe, into which Christianity was to be carried.[3] Luther's family, before his birth, had removed to Eisleben from Möhra, a village in the Thuringian Forest, near the spot where Boniface, the apostle of Germany, had first preached the Gospel.[4]

Six months later they removed to Mansfeld. "I am a peasant's son," he says, "my grandfather, my great grandfather were thorough peasants (rechte Bauern)." His domestic training was overstrict and austere. A like rigor characterized both father and mother. So he felt in after life. "The apple," he said, should always lie beside the rod.[5] But at heart, he said, "they meant it well." Then and ever after they were faithful in their affection and interest in his welfare. Both

[1] Archdeacon Hare, *Vindication of Luther against his recent English Assailants*, p. 2.

[2] Melancthon states that Luther's mother often said that while she remembered with certainty the day and hour, she could not remember the year of his birth; but his brother, James, an honest and upright man, said that it was 1483. *Vita M. Lutheri*, ii. It was not 1484, as some have thought. See *Studien u. Kritiken* (Oct. 1871, 1873, 1874). His birthday was the 10th of November.

[3] The coincidence of the great geographical discoveries with the access of light respecting the Gospel and with the revival of learning, is noticed by the French Reformer, Lefèvre, *Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les Pays de la Langue Française*, par A. L. Herminjard (1866), i. 94.

[4] A copious writer upon the earlier portion of the life of Luther is Jurgens, *Luther von seiner Geburt bis zum Ablass-streite*, 1483–1517. 3 vols. (1846).

[5] This is from one of his talks to his Wittenberg students. "My parents," he said, "dealt with me very severely, so that I became on account of it quite timid. My mother flogged me once on account of a little nut, so that after it blood flowed, and their severity and the rigorous life that they led with me was the occasion of my being driven into a cloister and becoming a monk." He points out the bad effect on children from excessive punishment from parents and schoolmasters.

parents were honest and just. The purity and piety of his mother are extolled by Melancthon. His father was unbending in his moral and religious principles. They taught him to pray and inculcated the decalogue, the Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. But the father had not a warm feeling towards the Clergy as a body. He suspected in the background the presence of hypocrisy and knavery. By the practice of economy, he was able to send his son, Martin, to the school in Mansfeld, where the poor teaching had a little Latin mixed in it and a large amount of harsh discipline. At the end of a year, his situation was improved by his being transferred to a better school in Magdeburg, where his teachers were a branch of the "Brethren of the Common Life." Having spent a year in study at Magdeburg, he was sent to the Franciscan school at Eismach, where he sang at the doors of the principal citizens, after the old German custom, for the means of support. Destined for the legal profession, he pursued, at the University of Erfurt, the Nominalist logic and the classics, and made a beginning in the study of Aristotle. He was twenty years old and had taken the Bachelor's degree when it happened that, while he was looking one day at the books in the Erfurt library, he casually took up a copy of the Latin Bible. It was the first time in his life that he had ever taken the sacred volume in his hands. Struck with surprise at the richness of its contents, compared with the extracts which he had been wont to hear in the Church services, he read it with eagerness and intense delight.[1] This hour was an epoch in his existence. Deep religious anxieties that had haunted him from childhood, moved him, two years later, against the will of his father, to forsake the legal profession and enter the Augustinian convent.

The motive for this change, in opposition to the plan of his father, was the monitions of conscience which made him feel more and more that this was the only right and safe course. The sudden death of a friend, some say by assassination at his side, followed by a stroke of lightning in a forest which was near costing him his life, moved him to a final decision. After

[1] Mathesius, *Historien von d. Ehrwürdigen M. Luther*, p. 3 (ed. 1580). This honest chronicler shows how grossly defective was the religious instruction given to youth by reference to his own case. The passage may be read in Marheinecke, *Geschichte d. deutschen Reformation*, i. 6.

an evening spent with his friends in social converse and enjoyment, he was received into the Erfurt Cloister of Augustinian Eremites (Hermits), an earnest and devout Order, and became a monk and a priest. He conformed to the rules, drawn from teachings of Augustine, and took the monastic vows. He studied Occam and the scholastic authors already known to him, but especially the Bible, a vulgate copy of which was placed in his hands. His father came to witness his first celebration of the mass after his ordination (in 1507), and acquiesced reluctantly in his adoption of a new career, but without being convinced of its wisdom.

Here we must pause to speak further of the religious experience of Luther; for whoever would explore the causes of history must look beneath the surface of events at the spiritual life of men. His earlier conception of Christianity is condensed in one expression, that he had looked upon Christ as a lawgiver, a second Moses, only that the former was a legislator of more awful rigor. "We were all taught," he says in his "Table-talk," "that we must make satisfaction for our sins, and that Christ at the last day would demand how we had atoned for our guilt, and how many good works we had done." Melancthon thus defines the motive which led him to adopt the monastic life: "Often when he thought on the anger of God or of the wonderful instances of divine punishment, he was seized with a terror so violent that he was well-nigh bereft of life." [1] When he held his first mass, and came to recite the words, "I bring this offering to thee, the eternal, living God," he was with difficulty restrained from rushing away from the altar in fear and dismay. "I had," he confesses, "a broken spirit, and was ever in sorrow." "I wore out my body with vigils and fastings, and hoped thus to satisfy the law and deliver my conscience from the sting of guilt." "Had I not been redeemed by the comfort of the Gospel, I could not have lived two years longer." This comfort he began to obtain through an old monk who pointed him to the sentence in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins," and to a passage in St. Bernard where reference is made to Paul's doctrine that "man is justified by faith." Still more was he aided by the judicious counsels of John Staupitz, the learned and pious Vicar-general of his order,

[1] *Vita M. Luth.*, v.

whose words, Luther afterwards said, pierced him "like the sharp arrow of a strong man." Staupitz told him that "Christ does not terrify but consoles."

In 1508, Staupitz, whom the Elector, Frederick the Wise, had made Dean of the Theological Faculty in the University at Wittenberg which he had founded, made Luther one of the instructors there. After giving, for a short time, lectures on philosophical teachings of Aristotle, he began his work as a theological teacher.

The Elector gave to the professors charge over the principal Church and the enjoyment of its incomes; his idea being not only to organize a place of instruction, but to collect a learned body, to which, in difficult and doubtful questions, he might, according to the prevailing custom, resort for counsel. Here, to quote another's words, we find the poor miner's boy who, having "become a young Doctor, fervent and rejoicing in the Scriptures, well versed in his Augustine, Aquinas, Occam, and Gerson, familiar with all the subtle theological and philosophical controversies of the day, was already spoken of honorably in wider circles, as a good, clever thinker, as a victorious assailer of the supremacy of Aristotle; took a lively interest in the struggles of the Humanists against the ancient barbarism; was esteemed by the most celebrated champions of the freedom of science; was exalted by the approbation of his colleagues, of the students that flocked to his lectures — in a word, was advancing with rapid steps to the highest honors of literary renown." He had the same relish for literature, in more full blossom, as he had when the only two books that he carried into the Convent were his Plautus and Vergil. He studied Augustine and Tauler, and caught glimpses of evangelical doctrine in them.[1] It was in these days that he came across the little book, so highly prized by him, which he published in 1516, giving it the title of "German Theology." Especially he devoted himself to the study of the Psalms, the prophets, and apostles. He applied himself likewise to the study of Greek. He had hardly begun to expound to his pupils the Epistle to the Romans, when his eye fastened upon the

[1] He recommends Tauler to his friend Spalatin (Dec. 14, 1516): "Neque enim ego vel in Latina, vel in nostra lingua, theologiam vidi salubriorem et cum evangelio consonantiorem." — De Wette, i. 46.

citation from a prophet, "the just shall live by faith." These words never ceased to sound in his ear. Going to Rome on a mission for his order (1511), he ran about full of devotional ardor, from church to church. On his knees he climbed the steps leading to the vestibule of St. Peter's Church. But those words of the Apostle Paul, "the just shall live by faith," more and more impressed themselves upon his thoughts. During his slow journey homeward he pondered these words. At length their full meaning burst upon him. "Through the Gospel that righteousness is revealed which avails before God — by which He, out of grace and mere compassion, justifies us through faith." "Here I felt at once," he says, "that I was wholly born again and that I had entered through open doors into Paradise itself. That passage of Paul was truly to me the gate of Paradise." [1] He saw that Christ is not come as a lawgiver, but as a Saviour; that love, not wrath or justice, is the motive in His mission and work; that the forgiveness of sins through Him is a free gift; that the relationship of the soul to Him, and through Him to the Father, which is expressed by the term "faith," the responsive act of the soul to the divine mercy, is all that is required. This method of reconciliation is without the works of the law. Good works are the fruit of faith, a spontaneous and necessary product. Now he had found a clew to the understanding of the Bible. If John was his favorite Evangelist, he found in them all one doctrine. But in the writings of Paul, whose religious development so closely resembled his own, he found a protest against judaizing theology and an assertion of salvation by faith, in opposition to a legal system, which gave him intense satisfaction. The Epistles to the Romans and Galatians were his familiar companions; the latter he styled, in his humorous way, his wife, his Catharine von Bora.

The logical consequences of his new position, in relation to the ordinances and ceremonies of the Church, and the principle of Church authority, had not occurred to the thoughts of Luther. It was only providential events, and the reflection which they induced, that brought the latent contents of his principle to distinct consciousness. The first of these events was the appearance of a hawker of indulgences, in the neighborhood of Wittenberg.

[1] *Præf. Operum* (1545).

This was John Tetzel, a Dominican from Leipsic, to whom this office had been committed. The mischief resulting from this traffic was forced on the attention of Luther by facts that were disclosed to him in the confessional. Members of his own flock brought to him in the confessional indulgence papers obtained from Tetzel which they regarded as a sufficient basis for absolution. He was moved to preach against it, to write to bishops in opposition to it, and finally to post his five and ninety theses on the door of the Church of All Saints at Wittenberg (1517). These were not meant as a formulated creed, plainly as they reflected the author's tendencies of thought. They were a challenge to an academic debate — a placard such as his colleagues were accustomed, at short intervals, to post. They were in Latin, being meant for scholars and students. Yet, the same night, he preached, in the Augustinian cloister, in German a sermon of the same tenor.

Indulgences, in the earlier ages of the Church, had been a relaxation of penance, or of the discipline imposed by the Church on penitents who had been guilty of mortal sin. The doctrine of penance required that for such sin satisfaction should be superadded to contrition and confession. Then came the custom of commuting these appointed temporal penalties. When Christianity spread among the northern nations, the canonical penances were frequently found to be inapplicable to their condition. Other satisfactions were accepted as an equivalent, such as pilgrimages, alms, etc. The practice of accepting offerings of money in the room of the ordinary forms of penance harmonized with the penal codes in vogue among the barbarian peoples. At first the priest had only exercised the office of an intercessor. Gradually the simple function of declaring the divine forgiveness to the penitent transformed itself into that of a judge. By Aquinas, the priest is made the instrument of conveying the divine pardon, the vehicle through which the grace of God passes to the penitent. With the jubilees, or pilgrimages to Rome, ordained by the popes, came the plenary indulgences, or the complete remission of all temporal penalties — that is, the penalties still obligatory on the penitent — on the fulfillment of prescribed conditions. These penalties might extend into purgatory, but the indulgence obliterated them all. In the thirteenth century, Alexander of Hales and Thomas

Aquinas set forth the theory of supererogatory merits or the treasure of merit bestowed upon the Church through Christ and the saints, on which the rulers of the Church might draw for the benefit of the less worthy and more needy. This was something distinct from the power of the keys, the power to grant absolution, which inhered in the priesthood alone. The condition of absolution, *contrition*, however, was reduced by Scotus and other schoolmen with him to *attrition*, *i.e.* servile fear of punishment. The eternal punishment of mortal sin being remitted or commuted by the absolution of the priest, it was open to the Pope or his agents, — for the Pope could delegate his prerogative, — by the grant of indulgences, to remit the temporal or terminable penalties that still rested on the head of the transgressor. Thus souls might be delivered forthwith from purgatorial fire. Pope Sixtus IV., in 1477, had officially declared that souls already in purgatory are emancipated *per modum suffragii;* that is, the work done in behalf of them operates to effect their release in a way analogous to the efficacy of prayer. Nevertheless, the power that was claimed over the dead was not practically diminished by this restriction. The business of selling indulgences had grown by the profitableness of it. "Everywhere," says Erasmus, "the remission of purgatorial torment is sold; nor is it sold only, but forced upon those who refuse it." [1] As managed by Tetzel and the other emissaries sent out to collect money for the building of St. Peter's Church, the indulgence was understood to be a simple bargain, according to which, on the payment of a stipulated sum, the individual received a full discharge from the penalties of sin or procured the release of a soul from the flames of purgatory. Purchasers of letters of Indulgence ("papal letters") thus interpreted them. Against this evil Luther protested to Archbishop Albert, one of the Commissioners in charge of the trade in Indulgences.[2] The forgiveness of sins was offered in the market for money. For one's personal sins, besides money, confession and contrition, were set down as expected, but very often little account was made of this circumstance. Other graces were purchasable — three at no other cost.

[1] *Præf. I. Epist. Corinth. Opera*, vii. 851. The Emperor Maximilian had first resisted and then patronized the traffic.

[2] See Briger, *Indulgenzen*, in Hauck, *Realencyklopädie*, ix. 76 seq.

These were the right to choose a confessor preferred by him, share in the merits stored up by the Church, and the deliverance of souls from purgatory. Against this lucrative trade Luther lifted up an earnest remonstrance. The doctrine of his theses was that the Pope can absolve only from the punishments which he himself imposes; that these do not reach beyond death; moreover, that the right to absolve pertains to bishops and pastors, not less than to the Pope; that the foundation of indulgences is in the power of the keys; that absolution belongs to all penitents, but is not indispensable, and is of less account than works of piety and mercy. If the Pope can free souls from purgatory, why not deliver them all at once? The treasury of merits is not denied, but the Pope cannot dispense it further than he holds in his hand the intercessions of the Church. The real and true treasure of the Church is asserted to be the gospel of grace. It is an error for preachers to say "that, by the indulgences of the Pope, a man is loosed and saved from all punishment." [1] If the Pope knew what extortion is practiced by the preachers of indulgences, he would rather, it is said, see St. Peter's Church reduced to ashes than built up out of the bones and flesh of the lambs of his flock. The theses were an attack on the Thomist theory of indulgences; but in spirit, though unconsciously to the author, they struck much deeper.[2]

No one can reasonably doubt that Luther's conscience was in the work on which he had entered. If ever a man was actuated by simple, profound convictions of duty, it was he.[3] The abuses against which he cried out were so iniquitous and mischievous in his eyes that he could not keep silent. He had no ambition to gratify. As far as his earthly prospects were concerned he had nothing to gain, but apparently, in case he persevered, everything to lose. He had no thought of throwing off his allegiance to the Roman Church. He makes no attack on the Pope. At a later time he said of the theses: "I allow

[1] From the 20th Thesis.

[2] For a literal copy of the theses, see Ranke, vi. 80; Löscher, *Reformationsacten*, i. 438. They are given in English in Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Ch.*, vi. 160 seq.

[3] Luther speaks of his motives in a letter to the Bishop of Merseburg (Feb. 4, 1520); De Wette, i. 402. His course, he says, would be that of a madman if he were actuated by wordly motives. See also, De Wette, iii. 215 (Letter to Melancthon): "Gloria mea est hæc una, quod verbum Dei pure tradidi, nec adulteravi ullo studio gloriæ aut opulentiæ."

these propositions to stand, that by them it may appear how weak I was, and in how fluctuating a state of mind I was when I began this business. I was then a monk, and a mad papist; ready to murder any person who denied obedience to the Pope." [1] He had embraced with his whole soul a truth which he knew to be in the Scriptures, but where it would lead him he could not anticipate. He was still an obedient son of the Church. His theses were propositions for dispute; they concluded with the sincere and solemn declaration that he affirmed nothing but left everything to the judgment of the Church. What he would do in case the Church should declare against him, and forbid him to teach what he knew to be the Gospel; what course he would take when the alternative should be presented of giving up a truth which stood in letters of light on the page of Scripture and had imprinted itself on his soul, or of renouncing an allegiance in which he had grown up, the obligation to which he had never found occasion to doubt — this was a question which did not occur to him. This portion of the career of Luther is intelligible only when we remember that the incompatibleness of the traditional view of Church authority with his interpretation of the Gospel was something that he discovered by degrees, and that was opened to him by the actual treatment which his doctrine received from the ecclesiastical rulers. Nothing but his intense, living belief respecting the nature of the Gospel could have sufficed to neutralize and at last overcome his established deference for Church superiors. "O!" he exclaims, "with what anxiety and labor, with what searching of the Scriptures, have I justified myself in conscience, in standing up alone against the Pope!"

The theses were designed to subserve an immediate, local end, but they kindled a commotion over all Germany. Both the religious and political opponents of the trade in indulgences greeted so able and gallant a spokesman.[2] "No one," says Luther, "would bell the cats; for the heresy-masters of the Preaching Order had driven all the world to terror by their

[1] *Præf. Oper.* (1546). The following year (May 30, 1518), in his letter to Leo X., covering the *Resolutiones* of the theses, he says, in connection with other expressions of spiritual allegiance: "Vocem tuam, vocem Christi, in te præsidentis et loquentis agnoscam." De Wette, i. 122.

[2] "Et fovebat me utcumque aura ista popularis, quod invisæ jam essent omnibus artes et Romanationes illæ, quibus totum orbem impleverant et fatigaverant." *Præf. Operum* (1545).

fires."[1] "Thanks be to God," exclaimed Reuchlin, "the monks have now found a man who will give them such full employment that they will be glad to leave my old age to pass away in peace."[2] Luther met grateful marks of courtesy and appreciation among the members of the Augustinian Order at their meeting at Heidelberg. Maximilian was not sorry to see the theses appear. Erasmus was at heart glad that a new and vigorous antagonist of superstition had stepped into the arena. The Pope was willing to see nothing more serious in the event than a quarrel of monks, and asked the General of Luther's Order of Augustinian Eremites to see that quiet was observed among his monks. But opponents quickly appeared; Sylvester Prierias, Master of the Palace at Rome, offended that his Dominican Order should meet with a rebuff from so insignificant a quarter, wrote a book against Luther which was both contemptuous and violent, asserting the unqualified infallibility of the Pope. Tetzel himself published a writing entitled "Counter-theses" which gained for him at once a doctorate, although written for him by Conrad Wimpina, a Catholic theologian, then of Frankfort on the Oder, who had been his teacher. Dr. John Eck, an expert, well-read, ambitious theological disputant, welcomed so fair an occasion to signalize himself.[3] Luther left none of them unanswered. Their appeals to human authority led him to plant himself more distinctly on the Scriptures; and the defense of the detestable practices which he had assailed inflamed his indignation still more against them. Meantime, in Germany his theses were circulating far and wide. Then followed his summons to Rome, which was modified, at the request of his noble-hearted protector, Frederick the Wise, whom Leo X., for political reasons, was anxious at that moment to conciliate, into a summons to Augsburg to meet the legate, Cajetan (1518). Cajetan was General of the Dominican Order. He was made Cardinal, and received the insignia at the Diet at Augsburg. He was an able theologian, an adherent of the system of Aquinas. Luther showed his profound respect for him by presenting himself before him when they met. But Luther found him supercilious, "a complete Italian and Thom-

[1] Gieseler, IV. i. 1, § 1, n. 16.
[2] Waddington, *History of the Reformation*, i. 98.
[3] These documents are in Löscher, *Reformationsacten*, ii.

ist," who would have no discussion, and whose requirement that Luther should retract his opinions, was met with a civil but decided refusal. "I will not," wrote Luther to Carlstadt, "become a heretic by denying the truth by which I became a Christian: sooner will I die, be burnt, be banished, be anathematized." [1] He confronted the doctrinal assertions which he was bidden to accept by affirming the supreme authority of the Bible and the necessity of faith to derive good from the sacraments. He broke with the cardinal, to whom his dark, glistening eyes were nowise agreeable, having left for him a protest appealing from the Pope ill informed to the same better informed.[2] He was aided in his escape through a small gate in the city wall by a friend and escorted on horseback by another on the road leading homeward, writing, on the evening of his arrival, that he was "full of peace and joy and wondered that so many and great men thought this trial of his anything important." When a bull was issued from Rome, asserting the doctrine as to indulgences, which Luther had impugned, he published his appeal from the Pope to a general council. Still he looked for a recognition of the truth from the authorities of the Church. Miltitz, the second messenger from the papal court, conciliatory in manner, and professing a sympathy with Luther in his hatred of the worst abuses of the vendors of indulgences, actually persuaded him to abstain from further combat on the subject, provided his opponents would also remain silent.[3] But this truce was quickly broken by the challenge of Eck to a public disputation on free will and grace, topics on which he had before debated with Carlstadt, one of the theological professors at Wittenberg; and by the programme which Eck put forth, much to the surprise of Luther, in which his opinions were directly assailed. In the open wagon which conveyed Luther to Leipsic to attend the disputation, there sat by his side Philip Melancthon, a young man of twenty-two, of precocious talents and ripe scholarship, whom his grand-uncle, Reuchlin, had recommended to the Elector as Professor of Greek, and

[1] Letter to Carlstadt (Oct. 14, 1518), De Wette, i. 161.

[2] Letter to Cajetan (Oct. 18, 1518), De Wette, i. 164.

[3] Luther did not believe in the sincerity of Miltitz's warm demonstrations. He speaks of his "Italities and simulations"— "Italitates et simulationes." Letter to Staupitz (Feb. 20, 1519), De Wette, i. 281. See also the Letter to Egranus (Feb. 2, 1519), De Wette, i. 216.

sent to Wittenberg with a glowing prophecy of the eminence that awaited him.[1] At the age of twenty his powers and his scholarship were alike mature. Unlike Luther in his temperament, they were the counterparts of each other. Melancthon found rest and support in the robust nature, the intrepid spirit of Luther; Luther admired, in turn, the fine but cautious intellect, and the exact and ample learning of Melancthon. Each lent to the other the most effective assistance. So intimate is their friendship that Luther dares to get hold of the manuscript commentaries of his young associate, whose modesty kept them from the press, and to send them, without the author's knowledge, to the printer.[2] "This little Greek," said Luther, "surpasses me in theology, too." By his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Melancthon laid the foundation of the Protestant exegesis; and his doctrinal treatise, the "Loci Communes," won for him a like distinction in this department of theology.

The disputation at Leipsic went on for a week between Carlstadt and Eck, on the intricate themes of free will and grace, in which the former defended the Augustinian and the latter the semi-Pelagian side, and in which the fluency and adroitness of Eck shone to advantage in comparison with his less facile adversary.[3] Then Luther ascended the platform. He was in the prime of life, in his thirty-sixth year, of middling height, at that time thin in person, and with a clear, melodious voice. It is a fact not without interest that he carried in his hand a nosegay of flowers.[4] He took delight in nature — in the sky, the blossoms, and birds. In the midst of his great conflict he would turn for recreation to his garden, and correspond with his friends about the seeds and utensils that he wanted to pro-

[1] Reuchlin to Melancthon, *Corpus Ref.*, i. 33. Reuchlin applies to him the promise to Abraham (Gen. xii.): "Ita mihi præsagit animus, ita spero futurum de te, mi *Philippe*, meum opus et meum solatium." Melancthon's original name was Schwarzerd, which, according to the prevailing custom, he rendered into Greek. To render proper names into Greek or Latin was usual with scholars. Thus Hausschein became Œcolampadius; Schneider — *i.e.* Kornschneider — was transformed into Agricola. Johannes Krachemberger wrote to Reuchlin to furnish him with a Greek equivalent for his not very euphonious name. Von Raumer, *Geschichte der Pædagogik*, i. 129.

[2] Letter to Melancthon, De Wette, ii. 238. See also ii. 303.

[3] A concise, instructive Article on "Eck" in Hauck, *Realencyklopädie*, v. 138 seq., describes this combatant and the other participants in the Leipsic Debate.

[4] For an interesting description of Luther, as he appeared in this Disputation, from the pen of Petrus Mosellanus, see Waddington, i. 130. See also Ranke, *Deutsch. Gsch.*, i. 281. It lasted from June 27, to July 16, 1519.

cure for it.[1] At home and with his friends he was full of humor, was enthusiastically fond of music, and played with skill on the lute and the flute; in his natural constitution the very opposite of an ascetic.[2] His powerful mind — for he was, probably, the ablest man of his time — was connected with a childlike freshness of feeling, and a large, generous sympathy with human nature in all its innocent manifestations.

Standing before Duke George, who proved to be a decided enemy of the Reformation, and before the auditory who sat with him, Luther discussed with his opponent the primacy of the Pope. In the course of the colloquy he declared that the headship of the Pope is not indispensable; that the Oriental Church is a true Church, without the Pope; that the primacy is of human and not of divine appointment. Startling as these propositions were, they were less so than was his avowal, in response to an inquiry, that among the articles for which John Huss had been condemned at the Council of Constance, there were some that were thoroughly Christian and evangelical. A feeling of amazement ran through the assembly, and an audible expression of surprise and anger broke from the lips of the Duke.[3]

The Disputation at Leipsic, by stimulating Luther to further studies into the origin of the Papacy and into the character of Huss and of his opinions, brought his mind to a more decided renunciation of human authority, and to a growing suspicion that the papal rule was a usurpation in the Church and a hateful tyranny.[4] Up to this time his attempt had been to influence the ecclesiastical rulers; now he turned to the people. His "Address to the Christian Nobles of the German Nation" was a ringing appeal to the German laity to take the work of reformation into their own hands, to protect the German people against the avarice and tyrannical intermeddling of the Roman

[1] "While Satan with his members is raging, I will laugh at him and will attend to my gardens, that is, the blessings of the Creator, and enjoy them praising him." Letter to Wenc. Link. (Dec. 1525), De Wette, iii. 58. See, also, iii. 172.

[2] But he was abstemious in food and drink; "valde modici cibi et potus," says Melancthon. Often for many consecutive days he would take only a little bread and fish. *Vita Lutheri*, v.

[3] Ranke, i. 279 seq.

[4] Before the Disputation at Leipsic, he wrote to Spalatin (March 13, 1519): "Verso et decreta Pontificium, pro mea disputatione, et (in aurem tibi loquor) nescio an Papa sit Antichristus ipse vel apostolus ejus: adeo misere corrumpitur et crucifigitur Christus (id est veritas) ab eo in decretis." De Wette, i. 238.

ecclesiastics, to deprive the Pope of his rule in secular affairs, to abolish compulsory celibacy, to reform the convents and restrain the mendicant orders, to come to a reconciliation with the Bohemians, to foster education. The spiritual Power enthroned at Rome was able by its pretensions to shield itself against reforms. It claimed to be the sole authoritative source of reforms. If Scripture was cited in behalf of them, it was answered that the Pope alone is competent to say what Scripture meant. In this harangue Luther strikes a blow at the distinction between laymen and priest, on which the hierarchical system rested. "We have one baptism and one faith," he says, "and it is that which constitutes a spiritual person." He compares the Church to ten sons of a king, who, having equal rights, choose one of their number to be the "minister of their common power." "A company of pious laymen in a desert, having no ordained priest among them, would have the right to confer that office on one of themselves, whether he were married or not; and "the man so chosen would be as truly a priest as if all the bishops in the world had consecrated him." The priestly character of a layman and the importance of education are the leading topics in this stirring appeal. His treatise on the Babylonian Captivity of the Church followed, in which he handled the subject of the sacraments. The number of these he limits to three, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Repentance, and holds that the last is not properly a sacrament, but a return to Baptism. Absolution is not a function confined to the priest. Transubstantiation is an idea which no one is bound to accept. The Eucharist is not a sacrifice. He condemns the denial of the cup to the laity. In one passage he declares that the bishop of Rome has become a tyrant; he, therefore, has no fear of his decrees. Neither he nor a general council has a right to set up new articles of faith. He attacks the statutes that violated Christian liberty, such as those which prescribed pilgrimages, fastings, and monasticism. He had discovered the close connection between the doctrinal and practical abuses of the church.[1] He regards with favor the marriage of the clergy, and divorce as in some cases lawful. At this time (1520) he sent to Leo X. a letter containing expressions of personal respect, but comparing him to a lamb in the midst of wolves and to Daniel among

[1] Waddington, i. 267.

the lions, and invoking him to set about a work of reformation in his corrupt court and in the Church.[1] With it he sent his Discourse *De Libertate Christiana.*

In this sermon on "The Freedom of a Christian Man," Luther set forth in a noble and elevated strain the inwardness of true religion, the marriage of the soul to Christ through faith in the Word, and the vital connection of faith and works. Faith precedes since by faith we are justified; but good works are necessarily the fruit of faith. In this treatise he rises above the atmosphere of controversy, and unfolds his idea of Christianity in the genial tone of devout feeling.

His course during the period between the posting of the theses and the final breach with Rome can be judged correctly only when it is remembered that his mind was in a transition state. He was working his way by degrees to the light. This explains the seeming inconsistencies in his expressions relative to the Pope and the Church, which occasionally appear in his letters and publications during this interval. "I am one of those," he said, "among whom Augustine has classed himself — of those who have gradually advanced by writing and teaching; not of those who at a single bound spring to perfection out of nothing." [2]

The Bull which condemned forty-one propositions of Luther, and excommunicated him if he should not recant within sixty days, after which every Christian magistrate was to be required to arrest him and deliver him at Rome, was issued on the 16th of June, 1520. It had been prepared by Cajetan, Prierias, and by Eck, whose numerous attacks on Luther in speech and in writings received the reward of carrying to Germany this Papal fulmination, in which one item in the condemned propositions ascribed to Luther was the 33d: "that to burn heretics is against the will of the Holy Spirit." The papal condemnation of errors was made binding on all persons and States. Was it not, then, *ex cathedra?* Luther, in review of it, cited with telling emphasis the condemnation of Christ of the treatment of heretics sanc-

[1] Luther seems to have entertained, up to this time, a personal regard and respect for Leo, but the intermingling of personal compliments with denunciations of his court and of the Roman Church (which is styled "a licentious den of robbers") was ill adapted to conciliate the Pope's favor.

[2] *Præf. Operum:* "Qui de nihilo repente fiunt summi, cum nihil sint, neque operati, neque tentati, neque experti."

tioned in it. Luther put forth a pamphlet in response to this *execrable Bull of Antichrist*, as he called it. On the 10th of December, in the public place at Wittenberg, — whither all friends of Evangelical truth had been invited on the bulletin board of the University, — in the presence of an assembly of doctors of the University, students and people, he threw it, together with the book of Canon Law, and a few other equally obnoxious writings, into the flames. By this act he completed his rupture with the Papal See. There was no longer room for retreat. He had burned his ships behind him.[1]

This decisive step drew the attention of the whole German nation to Luther's cause, and tended to concentrate all the various elements of opposition to the Papacy.[2] Luther found political support in the friendly disposition of the Elector, and from the jurists with whom the conflict of the spiritual with the civil courts was a standing grievance. The Papal Bull was extensively regarded as a new infringement of the rights of the civil power. The religious opposition to the Papacy, which had been quickened by Luther's theological writings, and which found an inspiring ground of union in his appeal to the Divine Word and his arraignment of the Pope as an opposer of it, engaged the sympathy of a large portion of the inferior clergy and of the monastic orders. Luther also found zealous allies in the literary class. The Humanists were either quiet, laborious scholars, who applied their researches in philosophy and classical literature to the illustration of the Scriptures and the defense of Scriptural truth against human traditions, of whom Melancthon was a type; or they were poets, filled with a national spirit, eager to avenge the indignities suffered by Germany under Italian and Papal rule, and ready not only to vindicate their cause with invectives and satires, but also with their swords. These were the combatants for Reuchlin against the Dominican persecution; the authors of the "Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum." Luther, with his deeply religious feeling, had not liked the tone of these productions. Ulrich von Hutten, one of the writers, the most prominent representative of the youthful *literati*, to whom we have just referred, had not been interested at first in the affair of Luther, which he regarded as a monkish and theological dispute. But he found help for his

[1] Strauss, *Ulrich von Hutten*, p. 397. [2] See Ranke, i. 307 seq.

own aims in its wide-reaching scope and became one of the Reformer's ardent supporters. He seconded Luther's religious appeals by scattering broadcast his own caustic philippics and satires, in which the Pope and his agents and abettors in Germany were lashed with unbridled severity. Abandoning the Latin, the proper tongue of the Humanists, he began to write in the vernacular. Hutten enlisted his friend Francis von Sickingen, another patriotic knight, and the most noted of the class who offered themselves to redress wrongs by exploits and incursions undertaken by their own authority, often to the terror of those who were thus assailed. Sickingen sent to Luther an invitation, in case he needed a place of refuge, to come to his strong castle at Ebernburg.[1]

We must pause here to look for a moment at the political condition of Germany. In the fifteenth century the central government had become so weakened, that the Empire existed more in name than in reality. Germany was an aggregate of numerous small states, each of which was, to a great extent, independent within its own bounds. The German king having held the imperial office for so many centuries, the two stations were practically regarded as inseparable; but neither as king of Germany nor as the head of the Holy Roman Empire, had he sufficient power to preserve order among the states or to combine them in common enterprises of defense or of aggression. By the golden bull of Charles IV., in 1356, the electoral constitution was defined and settled, by which the predominance of power was left in the hands of the seven leading princes to whom the choice of the Emperor was committed. No measures affecting the common welfare could be adopted except by the consent of the Diet, a body composed of the electors, the princes, and the cities. Private wars were of frequent occurrence between the component parts of the country. They might enter separately into foreign alliances. During the reign of Maximilian great efforts were made to establish a better constitution, but they mostly fell to the ground in consequence of the mutual unwillingness of the states and the Emperor that either party should exercise power. The Public Peace and the Imperial Chamber were constituted, the former for the prevention of

[1] See the very interesting biography by D. F. Strauss, *Ulrich von Hutten* (2d ed., 1871).

intestine war, and the latter a supreme judicial tribunal; but neither of these measures was more than partially successful. The failure to create a better organization for the Empire increased the ferment, for which there were abundant causes prior to these abortive attempts. The efforts of the princes to increase their power within their several principalities brought on quarrels with bishops and knights, whose traditional privileges were curtailed. Especially among the knights a mutinous feeling was everywhere rife, which often broke forth in deeds of violence and even in open warfare. The cities complained of the oppression which they had to endure from the imperial government and of the wrongs inflicted upon them by the princes and by the knights. Thriving communities of tradesmen and artisans invited hostility from every quarter. The heavy burdens of taxation, the insecurity of travel and of commerce, were for them an intolerable grievance. At the same time, all over Germany, the rustic population, on account of the hardship of their situation, were in a state of disaffection which might at any moment burst forth in a formidable rebellion. In addition to all these troubles and grievances, the extortions of Rome had stirred up a general feeling of indignation.[1] Vast sums of money, the fruit of taxation or the price of the virtual sale of Church offices, were carried out of the country to replenish the coffers of the Pope.

On the death of Maximilian (January 12, 1519), the principal aspirants for the succession, were Charles, the youthful King of Spain, and Francis I., the King of France. Charles, who was the grandson of Maximilian, and the son of Philip and of Joanna, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, inherited Austria and the Low Countries, the crowns of Castile and Aragon, of Navarre, of Naples and Sicily, together with the vast territories of Spain in the New World. The Electors offered the imperial office to Frederic of Saxony, a prince held in universal esteem for his wisdom and high character; but he judged that the resources at his command were not sufficient to enable him to govern the empire with efficiency, and he cast his influence with decisive effect in favor of Charles. The despotism of the French King was feared, and Charles was preferred, partly because, from the situation of his hereditary dominions in Ger-

[1] Ranke, i. 132 seq.

many and from the extent of his power, it was thought that he would prove the best defender of the Empire against the Turks. But the princes took care, in the "capitulation" which accompanied the election of Charles, to interpose safeguards against encroachments on the part of the new Emperor. He promised not to make war or peace, or to put any state under the ban of the Empire without the assent of the Diet; that he would give the public offices into the hands of the Germans, fix his residence in Germany, and not bring foreign troops into the country.

The concentration of so much power in a single individual excited general alarm. Such an approach to a universal monarchy had not been seen in Europe since the days of Charlemagne. The independence of all other kingdoms would seem to be put in peril. It was reasonably feared that Charles would avail himself of his vast strength to restore the Empire to its ancient limits, and to revive its claim to supremacy. This apprehension, of itself, would account for the hostility of Francis, apart from his personal disappointment at the result of the imperial election. But there were particular causes of disagreement between the rival monarchs which could not fail to produce an open rupture. In behalf of the Empire, Charles claimed Lombardy and especially Milan, together with a portion of Southern France — the old kingdom of Burgundy or Arles. As the heir of the dukes of Burgundy, he claimed the parts of the old dukedom which had been incorporated in France, after the death of Charles the Bold. It had been the ambition of France, since the expedition of Charles VIII., to establish its power in Italy. Francis, besides his determination to cling to the conquests which he had already made, claimed Naples in virtue of the rights of the house of Anjou, which had reverted to the French crown; he claimed also Spanish Navarre, which had been seized by Ferdinand, and the suzerainty of Flanders and Artois. The scene, as well as the main prize of the conflict, was to be in Northern Italy. The preponderance of strength was not so decidedly on the side of Charles as might at first appear. The Turks perpetually menaced the eastern frontiers of his hereditary German dominions, which were given over to Ferdinand, his brother. His territories were widely separated from one another, not only in space, but also in language, local

institutions, and customs. Several of the countries over which he reigned were in a state of internal confusion. This was true of Spain, as well as of Germany.

For months after the death of Maximilian, the Empire was without a head. Frederic of Saxony, who was disposed to protect rather than repress the movement of Luther, was regent in Northern Germany. Had he been in middle life and been endued with an energy equal to his sagacity and excellence, he might have complied with the preference of the Electors and have placed himself at the head of the German nation, which was now conscious of the feeling of nationality, and full of aspirations after unity and reform.[1]

Charles V. was not the man to assume such a position. He developed a tenacity of purpose, a restless activity, and a far-sighted calculation, which were far in advance of the expectations entertained respecting him in his early youth. But his whole history shows that he had no adequate appreciation of the moral force of Protestantism. His personal sympathies were with the old system in which he had been educated, and this was more and more the case in the latter part of his career. But apart from his own opinions and predilections, his position as ruler of Spain, where the most bigoted type of Catholicism prevailed, would have the effect to prevent him from severing his connection with the Roman Church. Moreover, the whole idea of the Empire, as it lay in his mind and as it was involved in all his ambitious schemes, presupposed the unity of the Church and union with the Papacy. The sacred character, the peculiar supremacy of the Empire, rested upon the conception that it was more than the kingdom of Germany, more than a German empire, that it was the ally and protector of the entire Catholic Church. Germany was regarded by Charles V. as only one of the countries over which he ruled. The peculiar interests of Germany were subordinate, in his thoughts, to the more comprehensive schemes of political aggrandizement to which his life was devoted. He acted in the affair of the Reformation from political motives. These, at least, were uppermost, and accordingly his conduct varied to conform to the interest of the hour. He might deplore the rise and progress of Lutheranism, but he desired still less the

[1] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 315.

success of Francis I. in the Italian peninsula. Moreover, in carrying out his plans for himself, and for the realization of the idea of the Empire, he might fall into conflict with the head of the Church. The old contest of pope and emperor might be revived. This was the more liable to occur in a period when the popes were anxiously laboring for their own temporal power, and for the advancement of their relatives in Italy. A combination of all the forces opposed to the new doctrine might suffice to crush it. But would this combination be effected? In addition to the jealousies that existed between the principal potentates, the Emperor, the Pope, and the King of France, divisions might easily arise among the Catholic princes in Germany, from the fear, for example, of the increasing power of the house of Austria. In addition to the conflicting interests out of which the Lutheran movement might find its profit, Germany and the shores of the Mediterranean were incessantly threatened by the Turks. It might be impracticable to persecute the disciples of the new doctrine, and at the same time secure their help against the common enemy of Christendom.

When Charles V. first arrived in Germany (in 1520, when he was crowned at Aix la Chapelle), he had reasons for coöperating with the Pope, and when this was the case his own preferences seconded the motive of policy. Yet Luther and the Lutheran cause had attracted a religious and national sympathy that was too strong to permit him to be condemned by the Emperor without a hearing. A less summary course must be taken than that which the papal party urged upon him.[1] Hence the summons which Luther received to appear and answer for himself at his first German Diet, the Diet of Worms (1521). In this summons Luther recognized a call of God to give testimony to the truth. He had letters of safe-conduct from the Emperor and the princes through whose territories his route lay, as he made his journey in the farmer's wagon, furnished by the city of Wittenberg. When he went to Augsburg to meet Cajetan, he had worn a borrowed coat. He was now an object of universal interest and attention. At Erfurt, the University went out in a procession to meet him, some on horseback, with

[1] Of the two nuncios who were sent to the imperial court, Caraccioli and Aleander, the latter was most distinguished. He figured in the Diet of Worms. Of him Luther has given a sarcastic description, which is quoted by Seckendorf, lib. i., sect. 34. § 81.

a great throng on foot, and welcomed him with a speech from the rector, who met at the head of a mounted escort at a place forty miles distant. He persevered in his journey, notwithstanding illness by the way and many voices of discouragement — mingled, to be sure, with others more cheering — which met him at every step.[1] When he reached the last station he was advised by a councilor of Frederick not to go on; the fate of Huss, it was said, might befall him. To which he replied: "Huss has been burned, but not the truth with him. I will go in, though as many devils were aiming at me as there are tiles on the roof."[2] He rode into the town at midday, through streets crowded with people who had gathered to see him. In the lodgings provided for him by the Elector he spent the time partly in prayer; at intervals playing on his lute; administering, also, the communion to a Saxon nobleman in the house, who was dangerously ill. On the following day, at four o'clock in the afternoon, having first solemnly commended himself to God in prayer, he was escorted by the imperial master of the horse, Ulrich of Pappenheim, to the hall of audience. He was conducted by a private and circuitous way in order to avoid the press of the multitude; yet the windows and roofs that overlooked the route which he took were thronged with spectators. As he entered the august assembly he beheld the youthful Emperor on his throne, with his brother, the Archduke Ferdinand, at his side, and a brilliant retinue of princes and nobles, lay and ecclesiastical, among whom were his own sovereign, Frederick the Wise, and the Landgrave, Philip of Hesse, who was then but seventeen years of age, together with the deputies of the imperial cities, foreign ambassadors, and a numerous array of dignitaries of every rank. Aleander, one of the Papal Nuncios, had arranged the order of proceedings. A jurist representing the Emperor had the same name, as it happened, as the old antagonist of Luther, Eck. It was estimated that not less than five thousand persons were collected in and around the hall. For a moment Luther seemed

[1] Some interesting details are given by Myconius, *Hist. Reformat.*, p. 38 (in Cyprian's *Urkunden*).

[2] Concerning the precise form of the expression, see Ranke, i. 334, and his reference to De Wette, ii. 139. But Spalatin gives the expression in the more usual form in which it is quoted: "Dass er mir Spalitino aus Oppenheim gin Wurmbs, schriebe: 'Er wollte gin Wurmbs, wenngleich so viel Teufel darrinnen wären, als immer Zeigel da wären.'" *Jahrb. vond. Ref. Luth.* (1521), p. 39 (in Cyprian's *Urkunden*). He arrived at Worms, April 16, 1521.

to be somewhat dazed by the imposing aspect of the assembly. He spoke in a low voice, and many thought that he was afraid. "It was planned that two questions should be propounded for Luther to return categorical answers." Some of his books had been placed near the Emperor. The first question was, Did he write them and others published under his name? His legal adviser was the Wittenberg Professor of Jurisprudence, Dr. Jerome Schur Schurff, who called for the reading of the titles. When this was done, Luther gave an affirmative answer. In reply to the second question whether he retracted what he had written in his books, the titles of which had been read, he asked for time to frame an answer suitable to so grave a question.[1] This was not with any thought of retracting. Time was given him, and on the following evening, at an hour so late that lamps were lighted, he was once more ushered into the assembly. He exhibited no sign of embarrassment, but in a calm, determined manner, in strong and manly tones of voice, he said that he could not retract those deemed correct by his opponents, nor, without conniving at wickedness, what he had written against the manifest, the evident tyranny and corruptions of the Papacy. Admitting that he had sometimes written against individuals with undue acrimony, yet he could not revoke what he had said without warranting his adversaries in saying that he had retracted his antagonism. He then declined to revoke his opinions or condemn his writings, until they should be disproved by some other authority than pope or council, even by clear testimonies of Scripture or conclusive arguments from reason. A council could err, he said; and he declared himself ready to prove it. When a final, definite answer to the question whether he would recant, was demanded, he replied that his conscience would not permit him: "Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen." There were many besides the Saxon Elector, whose German hearts were thrilled by the noble de-

[1] That Luther asked for delay has been made a ground of reproach by adversaries. See the answer to Maimbourg, in Seckendorf, lib. i. sect. 40, § 94. It has occasioned perplexity to Protestant writers. See Waddington, i. 348. But the explanation is that he had, in all probability, not expected a peremptory demand of this nature, and wished for time to frame an answer — especially in view of the fact that his writings contained, among other things, many personalities. The request for postponement was doubtless in accordance with the advice of Jerome Schurff, his legal assistant. On this topic see Gieseler, IV. i. 1, § 1, n. 79. Ranke observes: "Auch er nahm die Förmlichkeiten des Reiches für sich in Anspruch." *Deutsch. Gsch.*, i. 334.

meanor of Luther on that momentous day.[1] Tokens of admiration and sympathy were not wanting. Had violence been attempted, there were too many young knights, armed to the teeth and resolved to protect him, to give such an attempt an assurance of success. One who was present testifies that Luther returned to his lodgings, full of courage and cheerfulness, and declared that had he a thousand heads, he would have them all struck off before he would make a retraction.[2] The Elector Frederick expressed his delight that "Father Martin" spoke so excellently both in Latin and German before the Emperor and the Estates. The Elector, however, would have preferred to have had Luther speak more modestly in relation to Councils. Some advised Charles to disregard his safe-conduct, but he remembered the blush of Sigismund, when Huss looked him in the face at Constance, and refused. Even Duke George of Saxony cried out against an act so derogatory to German honor. It is worthy of note that the Emperor, in his last days, at the Convent of Yuste, when superstition had more sway over him, regretted his own fidelity to duty and honor at the time when he had Luther in his power.[3] At the request of the German princes, a commission made an unsuccessful effort to lead Luther to modify his position as to General Councils. When a part of the assembly had gone home, and after Luther had left, the decree was proclaimed that placed Luther under the ban of the Empire. This edict, in its spirit and language, as well in its provisions, was harsh and, in the highest degree, hostile to Luther. Immediately after the last conference of the commission, the Emperor had complied with his request for permission to leave, and, to the credit of Charles in all the future, sent him a safe-conduct. Bearing the same date as the sentence of outlawry against him was a treaty between Leo X. and Charles for the reconquest of Milan by the latter.[4] The Pope was also to abstain from complying with the wish of the Spanish Estates that he would soften the rigors of the Inquisition in Spain, a necessary instrument of Charles's tyranny.[5]

[1] Respecting the impressions made by Luther on various persons, see Ranke, i. 336 seq.

[2] Spalatin, p. 42.

[3] Robertson, *History of Charles V.*, Prescott's Appendix (iii. 482).

[4] Ranke, *History of the Popes*, i. 86.

[5] Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, i. 329.

Leo X. had opposed the election of Charles, and had made great exertions to secure the elevation of Francis to the imperial station. The Pope was resolved to prevent, if he could, the sovereignty of Naples and the imperial office from being in the same hands. He dreaded the consequences to his own states and the effect upon Italy generally that would result from such an accumulation of power. But after Charles had been chosen, both the Emperor and Leo saw the advantages that would attend upon their union, and the damage that each could inflict upon the other in case they persevered in their hostility. Accordingly they concluded an alliance, a main provision of which was that the parties were to divide between them the places to be conquered by the Emperor in Lombardy.

Thus Luther was placed under the ban of the Empire and of the Church. The two great institutions, the two potentates, in whom it had been imagined that all authority on earth is embodied, pronounced against him. The movement that had enlisted in its support to so great an extent the literary and political, as well as the distinctively religious, elements of opposition to Rome, was condemned by Church and State. It remained to be seen whether the decree of the Diet could be carried into execution. This was more difficult, even when it was withstood by a single German State, than it was to pass it. The genius of Luther himself, his power as an author, even of polemical pamphlets, were formidable obstacles. The influence of popular literature was a coöperative power. Of these, Ulrich von Hutten, despite his unstable principles, was one of the most effective of the assailants of the papal repressive policy and of the Worms edict in particular.

Now we find Luther in the Wartburg, the place of refuge chosen for him by the firm but discreet Elector. The Emperor's safe-conduct was good for only three weeks. The Elector arranged for his safety by a plan of his own. On the way he was interrupted by a company of mounted soldiers. Luther knew that he was to be hidden for a while, but knew not where. In the old Castle of Wartburg in the Thuringian Forest he remained for eleven months.[1] It was a very fine remark of Melancthon respecting the Elector to whose honest piety and discerning spirit the Reformation owes so much: "He was not

[1] His life there is well sketched by Schaff, *Church History*, vi. p. 330 seq.

one of those who would stifle changes in their very birth. He was subject to the will of God. He read the writings that were put forth, and would not permit any power to crush what he thought true." Luther studied the Scriptures in the Hebrew and Greek. On the Wartburg, he speaks often of his personal conflicts with the devil, with him the source and impersonation of evil, whom he held responsible for his physical and mental troubles. With him he conceived himself to be frequently wrestling. He was not without recreation. He made excursions, admiring the beautiful scenery and rejoicing in the music of the birds. Here, though enduring much physical pain consequent upon neglect of exercise,[1] Luther is incessantly at work, sending forth controversial pamphlets, writing letters of counsel and encouragement to his friends, and laboring on his translation of the New Testament, the first portion of that version of the entire Scriptures, which is one of his most valuable gifts to the German people.[2] Idiomatic, vital in every part, clothed in the racy language of common life, it created, apart from its religious influence, an epoch in the literary development of the German nation.[3] What has been said in modern days in depreciation of Luther's translation of the Bible into the vernacular is in the main without any just ground. It is true that there had been translations of the Bible into German before. Taken all together, they may be fourteen in number. But one fact of capital importance is that these were renderings of the Latin Vulgate, inclusive of its errors, while the basis of Luther's Bible was the original Scriptures. Moreover, Luther endeavored to interweave in his version the reliable results of Greek and Hebrew scholarship. Another fact is that the circulation of previous German translations was small, especially among laymen, compared with the immense as well as early circulation of Luther's Bible — deservedly styled the classic of the German people.

[1] He adverts to his physical disorders, De Wette, ii. pp. 2, 17, 29, 33, 50, 59.

[2] On the previous translations of the Bible into High and Low German, and on their small circulation, especially among the laity, see Hauck's *Realencyc.*, iii. 59 seq. See, also, Schaff's *Church History*, vi. p. 351 seq. The "Cambridge Modern History," vol. ii., *The Reformation*, p. 164 seq.; vol. ii., *The Renaissance*, p. 639 seq.

[3] On the incalculable advantage of Luther's Bible as furnishing a "people's book" — a "fundamental work for the instruction of the people" — there are good remarks by Hegel, *Phil. der Geschichte; Werke*, ix. 503, 504.

Troubles at Wittenberg called him forth from his retreat. An iconoclastic movement had broken out under the lead of Carlstadt, for the purpose of sweeping away in an abrupt and violent manner rites that were deemed incongruous with the new doctrine. This theologian, not without talents and learning, in his career at times supported Luther, and at intervals envied and opposed him. There was a certain consistency in his radical movement, and many of the changes that were attempted Luther and his followers themselves effected afterwards. But there was an unhealthy spirit of enthusiasm and violence, of which Luther saw the danger; and the innovators were associating with themselves pretended prophets from Zwickau, who claimed a miraculous inspiration and were the apostles of a social revolution. Luther comprehended at a glance the full import of the crisis. Should his movement issue in a sober and salutary reform, or run out in a wild, fanatical sect? It is a mark of the sound conservatism of Luther, or rather of his profound Christian wisdom, that he desired no changes that did not result spontaneously from an insight into the true principles of the Gospel. Better, he thought, to let obnoxious rites and ceremonies remain, unless they fall away from their perceived inconsistency with the Gospel, as the natural result of incoming light and the education of conscience. "If we," he said, "are to be iconoclasts because the Jews were, then like them we must kill all the unbelievers." [1] He was unwilling to have the attention of men drawn away from the central questions by an excitement about points of subordinate moment; and he counted no changes to be of any value, however reasonable in themselves, which were brought to pass by the dictation of leaders or by any form of external pressure. Seeing the full extent of the danger, he resolved, whatever might befall himself, to return to his flock. Luther never appears more grand than at this moment. To the prudent Elector who warned him against leaving his retreat, and told him that he could not protect him against the consequences of the edict of Worms, he wrote in a lofty strain of courage and faith. He went forth, he said, under far higher protection than that of the Elector. This was a cause not to be aided or directed by the sword. He who has most faith will be of most use. "Since I now perceive," he wrote, "that your Electoral Grace

[1] De Wette, ii. 548.

is still very weak in faith, I can by no means regard your Electoral Highness as the man who is able to shield or save me." [1] If he had as pressing business at Leipsic, he said, as he had at Wittenberg, he would ride in there if it rained Duke Georges nine days! [2] Arriving at Wittenberg, he entered the pulpit on the following Sunday, and by his persuasive eloquence in a series of eight discourses put an end to the formidable disturbance (1522).

Restored to Wittenberg, Luther continued his herculean labors as a preacher, teacher, and author. Commentaries, tracts, letters upon all the various themes on which he was daily consulted or on which he felt impelled to speak, continually flowed from his pen. In a single year he put forth not less than one hundred and eighty-three publications.[3]

Meantime the Council of Regency, who managed the government in the absence of the Emperor, steadily declined to adopt measures for the extirpation of the Lutherans. The ground was taken that the religious movement was too much a matter of conscience; it had taken root in the minds of too great a number to allow of its suppression by force. An attempt to do so would breed disturbances of a dangerous character. The drift of feeling through the nation was unmistakably in the direction of reform. Adrian VI., who was a man of strict morals, the successor of Leo X., found himself unable to remedy the abuses to which he attributed the Lutheran movement. The demand which he made by his legate at the Diet of Nuremberg, in 1522, that the decree against Luther should be enforced, was met by the presentation of a list of a hundred grievances of which the Diet had to complain to the Roman See. His successor, Clement VII., in whom the old spirit of worldliness, after the brief interval of Adrian's reign, was reinstated in the papal chair, fared little better at the Diet of Nuremberg, in 1524, when, through his legate Campeggio, he demanded the unconditional suppression of the Lutheran heresy. The Pope and the Emperor could obtain no more than an indefinite engagement to

[1] De Wette, ii. 139. [2] *Ibid.*, ii. 140.

[3] He says: "Sum certe velocis mentis et promtæ memoriæ e qua mihi fluit, quum promatur, quicquid scribo." Letter to Spalatin (Feb. 3, 1520); De Wette, i. 405. Nine years later he writes: "Sic obruor quotidie literis, ut mensa, scamna, scabella, pulpita, fenestræ, arcæ, asseres, et omnia plena jaceant literis quæstionibus, querelis, petitionibus, etc. In me ruit tota moles ecclesiastica et politica," etc. Letter to Wenc. Link. (June 20, 1529); De Wette, iii. 472.

observe the Worms decree, "as far as possible." This action was equivalent to remanding the subject to the several princes within their respective territories. It was coupled with a reference of disputed matters to a general council, and with a resolution to take up the hundred complaints at the next diet. A majority could not be obtained against the Lutherans and in favor of the coercive measures demanded by the Pope and by Charles. And the movement of reform was spreading in every part of Germany.

This aspect of affairs moved the papal party to the adoption of active measures to turn the scale on the other side — measures which began the division of Germany. Up to this point no division had occurred. The nation had moved as one body: it had refused to suppress the new opinions. Now strenuous efforts were put forth to combine the Catholics into a compact party for mutual aid and defense. At Ratisbon an alliance of this character was formed by the Catholic princes and bishops of South Germany, by the terms of which the Wittenberg heresy was to be excluded from their dominions, and they were to help each other in their common dangers. At the Diet of Nuremberg it had been determined to hold an assembly shortly after at Spires for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs. The princes were to procure beforehand from their councilors and scholars a statement of the points in dispute. The grievances of the nation were to be set forth, and remedies were to be sought for them. The nation was to deliberate and act on the great matter of religious reform. The prospect was that the evangelical party would be in the majority. The papal court saw the danger that was involved in an assembly gathered for such a purpose, and determined to prevent the meeting. At this moment war was breaking out between Charles and Francis. Charles had no inclination to offend the Pope. He forbade the assembly at Spires and, by letters addressed to the princes individually, endeavored to drive them into the execution of the edict of Worms. In consequence of these threatening movements, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse entered into the defensive league of Torgau, in which they were joined by several Protestant communities. The battle of Pavia and the capture of Francis I. were events that appeared to be fraught with peril to the Protestant cause. In the Peace of

Madrid (January 14, 1526) both sovereigns avowed the determination to suppress heresy. But the dangerous preponderance obtained by the Emperor created an alarm throughout Europe; and the release of Francis was followed by the organization of a confederacy against Charles, of which Clement was the leading promoter. This changed the imperial policy in reference to the Lutherans. The Diet of Spires in 1526 unanimously resolved that, until the meeting of a general council, every state should act in regard to the edict of Worms as it might answer to God and his imperial majesty. Once more Germany refused to stifle the Reformation, and adopted the principle that each of the component parts of the Empire should be left free to act according to its own will. It was a measure of the highest importance to the cause of Protestantism. It is a great landmark in the history of the German Reformation. The war of the Emperor and the Pope involved the necessity of tolerating the Lutherans.

In 1527, an imperial army, composed largely of Lutheran infantry, captured and sacked the city of Rome. For several months the Pope was held a prisoner. For a number of years the position of Charles, with respect to France and the Pope, and the fear of Turkish invasion, had operated to embolden and greatly strengthen the cause of Luther. But now that the Emperor had gained a complete victory in Italy, the Catholic party revived its policy of repression; and at the Diet of Spires, in 1529, a majority was obtained for an edict virtually forbidding the progress of the Reformation in the states which had not accepted it, at the same time that liberty was given to the adherents of the old confession in the reformed states to celebrate their rites with freedom. It is impossible to describe here the methods by which a reversal of the national policy was thus procured. The decisive circumstance was that Charles V., in consequence of his sympathy with the spirit of Spanish Catholicism, instead of putting himself at the head of the great religious and national movement in Germany, chose to maintain the ancient union of the Empire with the Papacy. The protest against the proceeding of the Diet, which gave the name of Protestants to the reforming party, and the appeal to the Emperor, to a general or a German council, and to all impartial Christian judges, was signed by John, the Elector of Saxony,

the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Prince of Anhalt; to whom were united fourteen cities, among which were Nuremberg, Strasburg, and Constance.

The party of reform did not consider itself bound by the action of the Diet, not only because its edict looked to compulsion in a matter that should be left to the conscience, but also because it overthrew a policy which had been solemnly established; a policy on the faith of which the princes and cities that were favorable to the evangelical cause had proceeded in shaping their religious polity and worship. The efforts made, especially by the Landgrave of Hesse, to combine the supporters of the Reformation in a defensive league, were chilled by the opposition of Luther to measures that looked to a war with the Emperor, and still more prevented from being successful by his determined unwillingness to unite with the Swiss, on account of what he considered their heretical doctrine of the sacrament. Luther and his associates were imbued with a sense of the obligation of the subject to the powers that be and with the sacredness of the Empire. The course for the Christian to take, in their judgment, was that of passive obedience. They likewise deemed it an unlawful thing to join with errorists — with men who rejected material parts of Christian truth. However open to criticism the position of the Saxon reformers was on both of these points, it should not be forgotten that their general motive was the sublime disregard of mere expediency, which had characterized, and, we may add, had ennobled their movement at every step.

In this state of things, the Emperor, flushed with success, met the representatives of the Empire in 1530, at the memorable Diet of Augsburg. The inconvenience and danger of keeping the Pope in captivity had caused Charles to wish for an accommodation with him. The desire of Clement VII., a self-seeking politician, to have Florence restored to his family, in connection with other less influential considerations, inspired him with a like feeling; so that amity was reëstablished. At the same time the Peace of Cambray terminated for a time the conflict with France. The Emperor was freed from the embarrassments which had hindered him from putting forth determined endeavors to restore the unity of the Church. He had been

crowned at Bologna, and was filled with a sense of his responsibility at the head of the Holy Roman Empire, the guardian of Christianity and of the Church. He was surrounded by the Spanish nobility as well as by the princes and representatives of the Empire. The design was to persuade, and, if this should prove impracticable, to overawe and coerce the Protestants into an abandonment of their cause. A faith and heroism less steadfast would have yielded to the tremendous pressure that was brought to bear upon them. It was not considered wise or safe for Luther to go to Augsburg. He was left behind in the castle of Coburg, within the limits of the Elector's dominion, but he held frequent communication with the Saxon theologians who attended the Elector. The celebrated Confession, drawn up by Melancthon, in a conciliatory spirit, but clearly defining the essential tenets of Protestantism — a creed which has obtained more currency and respect than any other Protestant symbol — was read to the Assembly. The reply, composed by Eck and other Catholic theologians, by order of the Emperor, was also presented. Then followed efforts at compromise, in which Melancthon bore a prominent part, and showed a willingness to concede everything but that which was deemed most vital. These efforts fell to the ground. They could invent no formulas on which they could agree, upon the merit of works, penance, and the invocation of saints. The elaborate and able Apology by Melancthon, in defense of the Confession, was not heard, but was published by the author. It acquired a place among the Lutheran creeds. The majority of the Diet enjoined the restoration of the old ecclesiastical institutions, allowing the Protestants time for reflection until the 10th of November of the following year; after which, it was implied, coercion would be adopted. Nothing in the history of the Reformation is more pathetic than the conduct of the Elector John at Augsburg, who, in the full prospect of the ruin of every earthly interest, and not without the deepest sensibility from his attachment to the Emperor and to the peace of the Empire, nevertheless resolved to stand by "the imperishable Word of God." The Reformers were willing to release him from all obligation to protect them, to take whatever lot Providence might send upon them; but this true-hearted prince refused to compromise in the least his sacred convictions.[1]

[1] John the Constant succeeded his brother, Frederick the Wise, in 1525.

The letters written by Luther during the sessions of the Diet exhibit in bold relief the noblest and most attractive sides of his character. The fine mingling of jest and earnest, the grand elevation of his faith, his serene, dauntless courage, and his broad sagacity, are never more striking. He takes time to write a charming letter to his little son.[1] To his friends at Augsburg he sportively writes that in the flock of crows and rooks hurrying to and fro, and screaming in a thicket before his window, he finds another Diet, with its dukes and lords, which quite resembles the imperial assembly. "They care not for large halls and palaces, for their hall is roofed by the beautiful, wide-spreading sky, its floor is simple turf, its tables are pretty green branches, and its walls are as wide as the world's end."[2] He will build there, in his seclusion, three tabernacles, one for the prophets, one for the Psalter, and another for Æsop; for not only will he expound the Scriptures, he will translate Æsop, too, for the instruction of his Germans.[3] Why had Master Joachim twice written to him in Greek? He would reply in Turkish, so that Master Joachim might also read what he could not understand.[4] He sets a trap to decoy a fastidious musical critic into an approval of a piece which Luther had himself partly composed, but which he contrives to have passed off as a performance at Augsburg, to celebrate the entrance of Charles and Ferdinand.[5] Suffering himself from prostration of strength and from a thundering in the head, which forced him to lay down his books for days, he enjoins Melancthon to observe the rules for the care of his "little body."[6] He exhorts the anxious Philip to the exercise of greater faith. If Moses had resolved to know just how he was to escape from the army of Pharaoh, Israel would have been in Egypt to-day.[7] Let Philip cease to be *rector mundi* and let the Lord govern.[8] In bearing private griefs and afflictions, Philip was the stronger, but the opposite is true, said Luther, of those which are of a public nature.[9] If we fall, he says, Christ falls, and I prefer to fall with Christ than stand with Cæsar.[10] He rejoices

[1] De Wette, iv. 41.

[2] *Ibid.*, iv. 4, 8, 13. The letter is dated from "the Diet of Grain-Peckers," April 28, 1530. Writing to Spalatin a few days after in the same strain, he adds: "Yet it is in seriousness and by compulsion that I jest, that I may repel the reflections which rush in upon me, if indeed I may repel them." De Wette, iv. 14.

[3] *Ibid.*, iv. 2.

[4] *Ibid.*, iv. 16.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 62.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

to have lived to have the Confession read before the Empire.[1] He bids Melancthon, if the cause is unjust, to abandon it; but if it be just, to cast away his fears. He is full of that sublime confidence which rang out in the most popular of his hymns, "the Marseillaise of the Reformation" —

"Ein fester Burg ist unser Gott"—

Three hours in the day he spent in prayer.[2] He writes to the Elector's anxious Chancellor: "I have lately seen two wonders, — first, as I looked out of the window, I saw the stars in the heavens and the entire beautiful vault which God has raised; yet the heavens fell not, and the vault still stands firm. Now some would be glad to find the pillars that sustain it, and grasp and feel them." "The other was: I saw great thick clouds hanging above us with such weight, that they might be compared to a great sea; and yet I saw no ground on which they rested and no vessel wherein they were contained; yet they did not fall upon us, but saluted us with a harsh look and fled away. As they pass away, a rainbow shines forth on the ground and on our roof."[3] "All things," he writes in another place, "are in the hands of God, who can cover the sky with clouds and brighten it again in a moment."[4] It is painful to him that God's Word must be so silent at Augsburg; for the Protestants were not allowed to preach.[5] He had a settled distrust of Campeggio and the other Italians: "where an Italian is good, he is most good," but to find such an one is as hard as to find a black swan. He went along with Melancthon in a willingness to make concessions, provided the evangelical doctrine and freedom in preach-

[1] De Wette, p. 71.

[2] Veit Dietrich, who was with him, wrote to Melancthon: "I cannot sufficiently wonder at this man's admirable steadfastness, cheerful courage, faith, and hope, in so doleful a time. He nourishes these tempers, however, by studious, uninterrupted meditation of God's Word. Not a day passes when he does not spend three hours, and those best suited for study, in prayer. Once I had the good fortune to hear him pray. Good God, what a faith appeared in his words! He prayed with such reverence that one saw he was talking with God, and yet with such faith and hope that it seemed as if he was talking with a father and a friend. 'I know,' he said, 'that Thou art our God and Father. So I am certain Thou wilt bring to shame the persecutors of Thy children. If Thou doest it not, the hazard is Thine as well as ours. In truth, the whole matter is Thine own; we have been only compelled to lay hands on it; Thou mayst then guard,'" &c. *Corpus Ref.*, ii. 159.

[3] De Wette, iv. 128. At an earlier day, on the occasion of his interview with Cajetan, in reply to the question where he would stand if the Elector should not support him, he answered, "Unter dem weiten Himmel!"

[4] De Wette, iv. 166.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 178.

ing it were not sacrificed. He had no suspicion of Philip, as some had. There were many ceremonies, which were trifles — *leviculæ* — not worth disputing about. Yet it did not belong to the magistrate to dictate to the Church in these points.[1] He would go so far, though not without reluctance, as to allow bishops to continue, but would permit no subjection to the Papacy. But Luther had no belief in the possibility of a compromise or reconciliation. There was a radical antagonism that could not be bridged over. There could be no agreement in doctrine; political peace alone was to be aimed at and hoped for.[2] Hence he rejoiced when the perilous negotiations between the opposing committees of theologians were brought to an end.

There are several occurrences not yet noticed, which took place in the interval between the Diets of Worms and of Augsburg, and which are of marked importance both in their bearing on the Reformation, and as illustrating the personal character of Luther.

One of these events was his marriage, in 1525, to Catharine von Bora. He resolved upon this measure, as we learn from himself, partly because he expected that his life would not continue long, and he was determined to leave, in the most impressive form, his testimony against the Romish law of celibacy. Another motive was a yearning for the happiness of domestic life, which his parents, who had embraced the new faith, encouraged. The scandal that his marriage caused, first among his own friends and then the world over, hardly fell short of that occasioned by the posting of his theses. The example of Luther was followed by many of his associates, which gave rise to the characteristic jest of Erasmus, that what had been called a tragedy seemed to be a comedy, at it came out in a marriage. The marriage of an apostate monk with a runaway nun betokened, in the view of the superstitious, the coming of Antichrist as the fruit of the unhallowed union. But it was one of those bold steps, characteristic of Luther, which, in the long run, proved of advantage to his cause. It gave him the solace of home, in the intense excitement and prodigious labors in which he was immersed for the rest of his days. There, with music, and song, and frolics with his children, in the circle of his friends,

[1] De Wette, iv. 210, 106. [2] *Ibid.*, iv. 110.

he poured out his humor and kindly feeling without stint. His diverting letters to his wife — his "Mistress Kate," "Doctoress Luther," as he styled her — and the tender expressions of his grief at the death of his children could ill be spared from the records of this deep-hearted man.[1]

Among these events are his controversies with King Henry VIII. and with Erasmus. From the outset it was evident that Luther must either give up his cause or contend for it against countless adversaries. His polemical writings are therefore quite numerous, and it shows the amplitude of his mind that he did not allow himself to be so far absorbed in this sort of work as to neglect more positive labors, through his Bible, catechisms, sermons, tracts, for the building up of the Church. He had to fight his own friends when they swerved from the truth, as did Carlstadt, and also Agricola, who set up a form of Antinomianism. But his principal literary battles were with Henry VIII. and with Erasmus. The intemperance of Luther's language has been since, as it was then, a subject of frequent censure. It must be remembered, however, what a tempest of denunciation fell upon him; how he stood for all his life a mark for the pitiless hostility of a great part of the world. It must be remembered, too, that for a time he stood alone, and everything depended on his constancy, determination, and dauntless zeal in the maintenance of his cause. Had he wavered, everything would have been lost. And mildness of language, he said, was not his gift; he could not tread so softly and lightly as Melanchthon.[2] His convictions were too intense to admit of an expression of them in any but the strongest language; in words that were blows. Moreover, he believed it to be a sound and wise policy to cast aside reserve and to speak out, in the most unsparing manner, the sentiments of his soul. It was not a disease to be cured by a palliative.[3] The formidable enemy against which he was waging war, was rendered more arrogant and exacting by every act of deference shown him, and by every

[1] See, for example, the letter (to Nic. Hausmann), August 5, 1528, after the death of his daughter. De Wette, iii. 364. A complete account of Luther's domestic character and relations is given by F. G. Hofman, *Katharina von Bora, oder Dr. Martin Luther als Gatte und Vater* (Leipsic, 1845). There is much of interest on the same subject, in a quaint little book, *D. Martin Luther's Zeitverkürzungen*, von M. Johann Nicolaus Anton (Leipsic, 1804).

[2] Letter to the Elector John, De Wette, iv. 17.

[3] "Aut ergo desperandum est de pace et tranquillitate hujus rei, aut verbum negandum est." Letter to Spalatin (February, 1520). De Wette, i. 425.

concession. There was no middle course to be pursued.[1] There must be either surrender, or open, uncompromising war. Besides, in his study of the Bible, he conceived himself to find a warrant for all his hard language, in the course pursued by the prophets, by Christ, and by Paul.[2] He felt that he stood face to face with the same Pharisaical theology and ethics that called forth the terrible denunciations recorded in the New Testament. If it was proper to call things by their right names then, it was proper now. He had been hampered at the beginning, he came to think, by a false humility, by a lingering reverence for an authority that deserved no reverence. He regretted that at Worms he had not taken a different tone; that he had said anything about retracting in case he could be convinced of his error. He would cast all such qualifications and cowardly scruples to the winds; he would stand by what he knew to be truth, without any timid respect for its adversaries.[3] These considerations are not without weight. A man whose natural weapon is a battle ax must not be rebuked for not handling a rapier. There is sometimes work to be done which the lighter and more graceful weapon could never accomplish. At the same time, with all Luther's tenderness of feeling, with his fine and even poetic sensibility, there was associated a vein of coarseness, a plebeian vehemence in speech, which, when he was goaded by opposition, engendered scurrility.

The book of Henry VIII. was directed against Luther's work on the sacraments, "The Babylonian Captivity."[4] It is marked by extreme haughtiness toward Luther, and is hardly less vituperative than the Reformer's famous reply. Luther was the hound who had brought up heresies anew out of hell; princes would combine to burn him and his books together. It was,

[1] "Mein Handel ist nicht ein Mittelhandel, der etwas weichen oder nachgeben, oder sich unterlassen soll, wie ich Narr bisher gethan habe." De Wette, ii. 244.

[2] He gives reasons for his vehemence in a letter to Wenceslaus Link (August 19, 1520), De Wette, i. 479. Among other things he says: "Video enim ea, quæ nostro sæculo tractantur, mox cadere in oblivionem, nemine ea curante." He says elsewhere that love and severity are compatible. De Wette, ii. 212. See, also, pp. 236, 243.

[3] Hallam censures Luther for "bellowing in bad Latin." But it was a cry with which all Europe rang "from side to side." Had he been a man of the temperament of Hallam, where would have been the Reformation? The Erasmians can seldom appreciate, much less look with complacency upon, Luther.

[4] *Adsertio Septem Sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum* (1521). It is published in a German translation in Walch's ed. of Luther's Writings.

throughout, an appeal to authority; Luther had audaciously presumed to set himself against popes and doctors without number. The impression of Henry's book itself wholly depended on the fact that its author sat on a throne. Luther probably meant to neutralize this impression by bemiring the purple of this regal disputant who had stepped forth, with his crown on his head, into the arena of theological debate, to win from the Pope, whom he obsequiously flattered, the title of Defender of the Faith. Subsequently, when Henry was reputed to be favorable to the Protestant cause, at the earnest solicitation of King Christian II. of Denmark and of other friends, Luther wrote to the King a humble apology for the violence of his language — making no withdrawal, however, of any portion of his doctrine. In composing this apologetic letter he was carried away, he says, by the promptings of others, to do what of himself he would never have done. Yet, notwithstanding the ungenerous reception and use of the letter by Henry, Luther did not regret that he had written it, as he did not regret the sending of a similar epistle to Duke George. As far as his own person was concerned, he said, he was willing to humble himself to a child; his doctrine he would not compromise. But such experiences confirmed him in the feeling, which he had entertained before, that humility was thrown away; that here was a mortal conflict, in which gentle words were misinterpreted, and therefore, wasted, and into which it was worse than folly to enter with his hands tied. Under such circumstances, a man must neither think of retreat nor of the possibility of placating the foe. It was natural that his experiences of controversy, in their action on a temper naturally combative, should contribute to carry Luther far beyond the bounds of charity, as well as of civility, in his treatment of the Sacramentarians, the adherents of Zwingli. Of this matter, where his intemperance was more mischievous, we shall speak in another place.

As to Erasmus and the Saxon Reformers, there was an earnest wish on both sides that he should not take part against them. Luther, and Melancthon still more, respected him as the patriarch of letters, the restorer of the languages, and the effective antagonist of fanaticism and superstition. When Luther published his work on the Galatians, he regretted that Erasmus had not put forth a book on the same subject, which would have

rendered his own unnecessary.[1] Erasmus, in turn, could not but applaud the first movement of Luther. His love of literature, not less than his religious predilections, would incline him strongly to the Lutheran side. The Wittenberg theologians were earnest champions of the cause of learning. But the caution of Erasmus was manifest from the beginning. He avoided the need of committing himself by professing to his various correspondents that he had not read the books of Luther. He told the Elector of Saxony, in an interview at Cologne, shortly before the Diet of Worms, that the two great offenses of Luther were that he had touched the crown of the Pope and the bellies of the monks. The expressions of sympathy with the Wittenberg movement that escaped him, notwithstanding his prudence, or which reached the ear of the public through the unauthorized publication of his letters, kept him busy in allaying the suspicions and anxieties of Catholic friends and patrons. But Luther and Erasmus were utterly diverse from one another in character; and "such unlikes," as Coleridge has said, "end in dislikes." Erasmus, it has been remarked with truth, lacked depth and fervor of religious convictions. He was a typical latitudinarian, in the cast of his mind.[2] His absorbing passion was for literature. He could not conceive how any man of taste could prefer Augustine to Jerome, while Luther could not see how any man that loved the Gospel could fail to set Augustine, with his little Greek and less Hebrew, infinitely above Jerome.[3] As the conflict which Luther had excited grew warm, attention was inevitably drawn away from the pursuit of letters and absorbed in theological inquiry and controversy; and this change Erasmus deplored. The heat which Luther manifested was repugnant to his taste. The Reformer's vehemence and roughness became more and more offensive to him.[4] Erasmus hated a commotion, and said himself that he would sacrifice a part of the truth for the sake of peace, and that he was not of the stuff which martyrs are made of. He could be an Arian or a Pelagian, he said, if

[1] De Wette, i. 335.

[2] It is the "moderation" of Erasmus that leads Gibbon (ch. liv. n. 38) to say: "Erasmus may be considered the father of rational theology. After a slumber of an hundred years, it was revived by the Arminians of Holland, Grotius, Limborch, and Le Clerc; in England by Chillingworth, the latitudinarians of Cambridge (Burnet, *Hist. of his own Times*, vol. i. pp. 261–268, octavo edition), Tillotson, Clarke, Hoadley," etc.

[3] De Wette, i. 52.

[4] Strauss, *Ulrich von Hutten*, p. 486.

the Church had so made its creed; and yet, in his inmost heart, and apart from the feeling that he must be anchored somewhere, the authority of the Church counted for little. Being by temperament, by his personal relations, and by the effect of years, and, we might add, on principle, a time-server, he found himself, being also the most prominent man of the age, in an embarrassing situation. He must stay in the Church, yet, if possible, offend neither party.[1] Luther saw through him, and in a letter that was not meant to be unfriendly, he irritated the great scholar by inviting him to be a spectator of the magnificent tragedy in which he was not fitted to be an actor.[2] The refusal of Erasmus to see Ulrich von Hutten when he visited Basel, and the furious controversy that ensued between them, — for Erasmus was provoked into the use of a style which he very much deplored in Luther, an inconsistency which Luther did not fail to point out, — was the first decided step in the alienation of the great scholar from the evangelical party. Then Erasmus at length yielded to the persuasions that had long been addressed to him from the papal side, and took the field against Luther, in a treatise on free will; in which the Reformer was assaulted on a subject where his extravagant language exposed him to an easy attack, and on which Erasmus could write with some warmth of conviction. He and his associates preferred the Greek theology to that of Augustine, on this subject of the will. More once complained that Luther "clung by tooth and nail to the doctrine of Augustine." Theologians who explain difficulties by referring to "original sin," Erasmus had once likened to astrologers who fall back on the stars. The moderation of the personal references to Luther in the book of Erasmus did not restrain the former from the use of the severest style in his reply. Erasmus, he thought, had taken his place under the banner of the Pope; he had come out on the semi-Pelagian side, from which the whole system of salvation by merit was inseparable; and the higher his standing, the more unsparing must be the attack upon him. The rejoinder of Erasmus — the "Hyperaspistes," the first part of which appeared in 1525, and the second in 1527 — completed, if anything was wanted to complete, their mutual estrangement. From that time Luther habitually spoke of him

[1] Luther notices the "dexterity" of Erasmus, De Wette, i. 396.
[2] Letter to Erasmus (April, 1524), De Wette, ii. 498.

as a disciple of Lucian, a disciple of Epicurus, an enemy of all religions, especially the Christian, and flung at him other appellations, which, if literally unjust, sometimes had the truth of a caricature. Finally, a long letter of Luther to his friend, Nicholas von Amsdorf, in which the author undertook to maintain a charge of skepticism, as well as of frivolous levity, against Erasmus, by reference to his comments on Scripture, drew out a reply which is marked by all the refinement, ingenuity, and wit for which Erasmus was deservedly famous. From this time, his animosity against the Protestant cause went on increasing. Luther more than once complains that Erasmus could make the sins and distress of the Church a theme for jesting.[1] In the epistle to Amsdorf, he charges him with infusing into the young a spirit at war with religious earnestness.[2]

[1] De Wette, i. 76. He finds fault with Erasmus, "senex et theologus," for treating sacred things in a jesting way, in a period "negotiosissimo et laborioso." *Ibid.*, iv. 508; Letter to Nic. Amsdorf. Luther, it will be remembered, had not thought well of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum.*

[2] *Ibid.*, iv. 519. The letters of Luther set forth the rise and progress of his estrangement from Erasmus. In a letter to Spalatin (October 19, 1516) he expresses his dissent from the idea of Erasmus that, by "works of the law," Paul means ceremonial works alone, gives his own view of justification, and wishes Spalatin to try to alter the views of Erasmus on this point. He writes to Lange (March 1, 1517), that he reads Erasmus — "nostrum Erasmum," he styles him — but that his esteem for him diminishes daily, that Erasmus exposes well the ignorance of priests and monks, but does not dwell sufficiently on Christ and the grace of God: "humana prævalent in eo plus quam divina." He comes to this conclusion reluctantly, and is careful not to disclose it, in order not to give aid to the enemies and rivals of Erasmus. Luther's censure of the levity of Erasmus in reference to the calamities of the Church is frequently expressed. Erasmus (April 14, 1519) wrote to the Elector a letter, in which he complimented Luther. In writing to Spalatin (May 22, 1519), Luther expresses his gratification. On the 28th of the previous March, Luther had written a respectful letter to Erasmus himself, in which his talents and services are fully appreciated; to which Erasmus replied, in May, in gracious, but cautious terms. Everything shows that Erasmus was favorable to Luther, but did not deem it safe to betray the extent of his sympathy. His position Luther fully understood, as is shown in many passages of his letters. In a letter to Spengler (November 17, 1520) Luther remarks that he has private disputes with Melancthon on the question how far from the right way Erasmus is — Melancthon, of course, being more favorable to the great Humanist. In reference to the advice of Erasmus that Luther would be more moderate, he writes (to Spalatin, September 9, 1521) that Erasmus looks "non ad crucem, sed ad pacem": "memini me, dum in præfatione sua in Novum Testamentum de se ipso diceret: 'gloriam facile contemnit Christianus'— in corde mea cogitasse: 'O Erasme, falleris, timeo. Magna res est gloriam contemnere.' " To Spalatin (May 15, 1522), he charges Erasmus with betraying, "in sua Epistolarum farragine," his secret hostility to him and his doctrine, and declares that he prefers an open foe like Eck to a tergiversating person, now friendly and now hostile. To Caspar Börner (May 28, 1522), he writes that he is aware that Erasmus dissents from him on predestination, but that he has no fear of Erasmus's eloquence: "potentior est veritas quam eloquentia, potior spiritus quam ingenium, major fides quam eruditio." To Œcolampadius (June 20, 1523), he

If we look below the accidents of the controversy, and cast aside particulars in which Luther was often as incorrect, as he was uncharitable in his general estimate of his antagonist, we must conclude that Luther was still in the right in his judgment respecting the reform of the Church. It could not come from literature. Erasmus could assail the outworks, such as the follies of monkery, but the principles out of which these obnoxious practices had grown, he would touch only so far as it could be done without danger to himself and without disturbance. Luther had been himself a monk, not like Erasmus for a brief time and through compulsion, but of choice, with a profound inward consecration. He had personally tested, with all sincerity and earnestness, the prevailing system of religion, until he discerned the wrong foundations on which it rested. He saw that the tree must be made good before the character of the fruit could be changed. And there was still a vitality in the old system with which the weapons of Erasmus were quite insufficient to cope. It is humiliating to see him resorting to the Pope's legate, and then to the Pope himself, for leave to read the writings of Luther. It is safe to affirm that the Erasmian school would eventually have been driven to the wall by the monastic party, which sooner or later would have combined its energies; and that without the sterner battle waged by Luther, the literary reformers, with their lukewarm, equivocal position in relation to fundamental principles would have succumbed to the terrors of the Inquisition. There was

speaks of the covert hostility of Erasmus to the Lutheran doctrine, and characterizes him thus: "Linguas introduxit, et a sacrilegis studiis revocavit. Forte et ipse cum Mose in campestribus Moab morietur: nam ad meliora studia (quod ad pietatem pertinet) non provehit." In April, 1524, Luther wrote a letter to Erasmus, in which he makes an offer of peace, but in a manner so condescending and with such plain observations upon the limitations of Erasmus as to courage and discernment, that he could not fail to be irritated by it. In this singular epistle, which was well meant but very ill calculated to produce amity, Luther expresses the wish that his friends would desist from assailing Erasmus; as they would do, it is added, "if they considered your imbecility and weighed the greatness of the cause, which has long since exceeded the measure of your powers." He condoles with his correspondent in view of the great amount of enmity which Erasmus had excited against himself, "since mere human virtue such as yours is insufficient for such burdens." The reply of Erasmus, though dignified in tone, shows how deeply he was offended. In September of the same year he gave way to the importunities of the opponents of Luther and wrote his book *De Libero Arbitrio*, which was followed by an acrimonious controversy. From this time Luther denounces him without reserve. He calls Erasmus that "most vain animal" (De Wette, iii. 98), predicts that he will "fall between two stools" (*Ibid.*, 447); and characterizes him in the manner stated above.

certain to be an aroused, implacable earnestness on the papal side: a like spirit was required in the cause of reform. At the same time, justice to Erasmus requires that he should be judged rather by his relation to the preceding age, than by comparison with Luther.[1] The forerunner is not to be weighed by the standards of the era which he has helped to introduce.

As we have touched on the personal traits of Luther as a controversialist, it is well to add here that of all men he may most easily be misrepresented. A man of imagination and feeling, with intense convictions that burned for utterance, he never took pains to measure his language. He put forth his doctrine in startling, paradoxical forms, out of which a cold-blooded critic, or artful polemic could easily make contradictions and absurdities. In this respect, he was as artless and careless as the writers of the Bible. Like Paul, and on the same grounds, he has been charged with favoring antinomian laxness and positive immorality. It is a charge which emanates from ignorance or malice. It is frequently made by plodders who are incapable of interpreting the fervid utterances, of entering into the profound conceptions of a man of genius, but are simply shocked by them.[2]

One other event of which we have to speak here is the Peasants' War. The preaching of Luther and his associates produced inevitably a ferment, in which manifold tendencies to social disorder might easily acquire additional force. The discontent of the nobles or knights with the princes sought to ally itself with the new zeal in behalf of a pure Gospel; but this revolt was brought to an end by the defeat and death of Francis of Sickingen. The disaffection of the peasants, on account of the oppression under which they suffered, had long existed. It had led in several instances to open insurrection. Long before the Reformation, there had been mingled with these political tendencies a religious element.[3] But their discontent was fomented by the spread among them of the Lutheran doctrine of Christian liberty, from which they drew inferences in accord with their own aspirations, and by the

[1] Strauss, *Ulrich von Hutten*, p. 481.

[2] The criticisms of Hallam upon Luther, together with the erroneous statements of Sir William Hamilton, are thoroughly answered by Archdeacon Hare, *Vindication of Luther*, etc. (2d ed., 1855).

[3] Ranke, i. 127.

popular excitement which the Reformation kindled. There was a secular and religious side to the revolt. Heavier burdens had been laid upon the laboring class by their lay and ecclesiastical masters. The forcible repression of the evangelical doctrine was an added grievance. Their roll of complaints carries us forward to the days of the French Revolution; nor can it be questioned that many of them called loudly for redress.[1] Luther had much sympathy with them; he maintained that their grievances should be removed; he advised mutual concessions; but he was inflexibly and on principle opposed to a resort to arms. He had counseled Sickingen and Hutten against it.[2] In general he set his face against every attempt to transfer the cause of reform from the arena of discussion to the field of battle. What would become of schools, of teaching, of preaching, he said, when once the sword was drawn? It is a part of his deliberate resolution to keep the minds of men upon the main questions in controversy, that there might be an intelligent, enlightened, free adoption of the truth. The peasants, he held, had no right to make an insurrection. He exerted himself in vain to persuade them to abstain from it. Like the early Christians, he felt that it was a spiritual agency, and not force, that could give to the truth a real victory. He wanted to keep the cause of God clear of the entanglements of worldly prudence and worldly power. Hence, when their great rebellion broke out in 1524 and 1525, he exhorted the princes to put it down with a strong hand. The terms of this appeal seem ruthless. He saw, in the event of the success of the revolt, nothing but the destruction of civil order and a wild reign of fanaticism.[3] The abolition of all existing authority in Church and State, equality in rank and in property, were a part of the peasants' creed. After the victory Luther urged the victors to the exercise of compassion, reminding them that it was not the hand of man but God that had quieted the disorder. If the fact of

[1] Häusser, *Gsch. d. Zeitalt. d. Ref.*, p. 103 seq.; Ranke, *Deutsche Gsch.*, i. 134.

[2] Letter to Spalatin (January 16, 1521), De Wette, i. 543.

[3] Ranke, *Deutsche Gsch.*, i. 149. Waddington (ii. 154 seq.) and other writers censure Luther with much severity for his denunciation of the peasants. But Luther considered that there was a fearful crisis, in which the foundations of society were in peril. The insurrection was very formidable in numbers and strength. . . . The temperament of Luther, it would seem, was such that were his disapproval excited by something detested as being base and perilous, an intemperate, not unlikely passionate, outburst of his feeling would be likely to occur, with none of the qualifications natural in another mood of mind.

the revolt, evidently occasioned as it was, to some extent, by the Reformation, produced a temporary reaction against it, this effect was diminished by the outspoken, strenuous opposition which Luther had made to the ill-fated enterprise. The Reformation is not responsible for the Peasants' War. It would have taken place if the Protestant doctrines had not been preached; and it was caused by inveterate abuses for which the ecclesiastical princes in Germany, by their extortions and tyranny, were chiefly accountable.

CHAPTER V

THE GERMAN REFORMATION TO THE PEACE OF AUGSBURG, 1555: ZWINGLI AND THE SWISS (GERMAN) REFORMATION

At the time when Luther was beginning to attract the attention of Europe, another reformatory movement, of a type somewhat peculiar, was springing up on a more contracted theater. The Swiss Confederacy began in the Covenant of three rural or "forest" cantons, in 1291, which, by the accession of other territories and city states, had become, in the time of the Reformation, thirteen in number, connected by a loose bond in a Diet of representatives. In the fifteenth century, the Swiss, whose military strength had been developed in their long and victorious struggle for independence, and who had done much to revolutionize the art of war by showing that infantry might be more than a match for cavalry, were employed in large numbers, as mercenary soldiers, in Italy. The Pope and the French King were the chief competitors in effects to secure these valuable auxiliaries. The means by which this was accomplished were demoralizing in their influence upon the country. The foreign potentates purchased, by bribes and pensions, the coöperation of influential persons among the Swiss, and thus corrupted the spirit of patriotism. The patronage of the Church was used in an unprincipled manner, for the furtherance of this worldly interest of the Pope. Ecclesiastical discipline was sacrificed, preferments and indulgences lavishly bestowed, in order that the hardy peasantry might be enticed from their homes to fight his battles in the Italian peninsula. These brought home from their campaigns vicious and lawless habits. At the same time, in consequence of what they witnessed in Italy, much of their reverence for the rulers of the Church was dispelled. The corrupt administration of the Church had a like effect on their countrymen who remained at home. Thus there was a combination of agencies which

operated to debase the morals of the Swiss people, at the same time that their superstitious awe for ecclesiastical superiors was vanishing. The influence of the literary culture of the age, also, made itself felt in Switzerland. High schools had sprung up in various cities. A circle of men who were interested in classical literature and were gradually acquiring more enlightened ideas in religion, had their center in Basel where Erasmus took up his abode in 1516 and became their acknowledged head.[1]

Ulrich Zwingli, the founder of Protestantism in Switzerland, was born on the 1st of January, 1484, close by Wildhaus, a small village in a picturesque situation on the mountains which overlook the valley of Toggenburg. He was only a few weeks younger than Luther. The father of Zwingli was the principal magistrate of the town.[2] Young Zwingli spent his boyhood under teachers near home, until he was sent to school first at Basel, and then at Berne. Bright-minded and eager for knowledge, he was also early distinguished for his love of truth, which never ceased to be one of the marked virtues of his character. Like Luther, he had an extraordinary talent for music. He learned afterwards to play on various instruments. Among his associates at the University of Vienna, where he was first placed, was the famous Eck. There he took up the study of scholastic philosophy. At Basel, to which place he was transferred, Capito and Leo Juda, who were to be his confederates in the work of reform, were among his fellow-students. Here his principal teacher was Thomas Wyttenbach, a man of liberal tendencies, as well as of devout character, who predicted the downfall of the scholastic theology, and imparted impulses to his pupils which eventually carried them beyond his own position. Zwingli was a zealous student of the Latin classics, and after becoming at the age of twenty-two, a pastor at Glarus, he prosecuted the reading of the Roman authors, partly for the truth which he loved to seek in them, and partly to make himself an orator. He entered, also, with diligence upon the study of Greek. His sympathy with Humanism was native and grew with advancing years. Circumstances conspired to heighten his interest in

[1] There was a literary public. See Ranke, *Deutsch. Gsch.*, ii. 40, 14.

[2] See the account of Zwingli's family in the excellent biography of J. C. Mörikofer, *Ulrich Zwingli nach den urkundlichen Quellen*, 2 vols. (1867), and, also, in S. M. Jackson's valuable *Huldreich Zwingli* (1901).

Erasmus. He carefully copied with his own hand the epistles of Paul in the original, that he might have them in a portable volume and commit them to memory. More and more he devoted himself to the examination of the Bible and deferred to its authority. He read the Fathers, as counselors, not as authoritative guides. He was deeply moved by happening to read a poem of Erasmus in which Jesus was depicted as complaining that men do not seek all good of him, their Saviour and Helper. This, as he said years later, led him to ask himself "why we look to any creature to lend us help." Seeking for "a touchstone of truth," he said of the result that he "came to rely on no single thing save that which came from the mouth of the Lord." Two cardinal principles, which Luther reached by the power of personal experience, Zwingli arrived at on the path of Humanistic study, — not involving at once a severance from Rome. He was obliged to leave Glarus, on account of his bold opposition to the system of pensions and of mercenary service under the French. Zwingli was a thorough patriot from his early boyhood. He listened by the hearthstone to tales of gallant work done by his relatives and townsmen in the recent war against Charles of Burgundy. As he grew older he witnessed the deleterious effect of the French influence, to which we have adverted. He saw, moreover, the low condition of morals among the clergy, and became more alive to the deplorable state of things from the bitter compunction which his own compliance with temptation in a single instance cost him.[1] At first he did not look upon military service which was rendered at the call of the Pope, the Head of the Church, with the same disapprobation which he felt in regard to the French. He even accompanied his parishioners to war, and was present on the field of Marignano. He, moreover, thought it no wrong to receive a pension from the Pope, which was first given him for the purchase of books. But his public opposition at Glarus to the French party, which was strong there, obliged him to leave and to take up his abode at a smaller place, Einsiedeln, where he took the office of pastor and preacher in the Church of the Virgo Eremitana — Virgin of the Hermitage. This was

[1] *Leben und Ausgewählte Schriften d. Väter u. Begründer d. Ref. Kirche.* Christoffel, *Hulderich Zwingli, Leben u. Ausgewählte Schriften,* i. 10. *Opera Zwinglii,* viii. 54 seq.

in 1516. Just before this change he made a visit to Basel to see Erasmus, by whom he was most cordially received. In letters to one another each expressed his admiration of the other. When the line was drawn between the two great ecclesiastical parties, their intimacy was broken off. At Einsiedeln there was a cloister as well as a church, with a store of legends. It was the chief resort of pilgrims from all the adjacent region. Indulgences were liberally bestowed, and an image of Mary, of peculiar sanctity, attracted crowds of devotees. Zwingli, without directly assailing the worship of the Virgin, preached to the throng of visitors the doctrine of salvation by Christ, and of his mercy and sufficiency as a Saviour, which had been more and more impressed on his mind by the investigation of the Scriptures. The people felt that they were hearing new truth, and a striking effect was produced on many. He had now fully made up his mind to go to the Word of God as the ultimate authority, in preference to the dogmas of men. To individuals, to his friend Capito and to Cardinal Sitten, he stated that he found in the Scriptures no foundation for the rule of the Papacy.[1] He even said to Capito, in 1517, that he thought the Papacy must fall. In 1518 he preached against one Samson, who, like Tetzel, was a peddler of indulgences, so that the traffic was stopped in the Canton of Schweitz, and Samson obliged to decamp. In 1519, owing very much to the influence of leading opponents of the French party, Zwingli was transferred to the Cathedral Church of Zurich, then a city of about seven thousand inhabitants. Here he carried out his purpose, which he announced at the outset, of expounding the Bible to his hearers, and of inculcating the truth which he found there. In this way, in sermons which were heard by a multitude with eager interest, he went through the Gospel of Matthew. He explained, also, the epistles of Paul; and for fear that some would have less respect for Paul, as he was not one of the twelve, he showed the identity of Peter's doctrine by an exposition of his epistles. He had great power as a preacher: one of his hearers said that it seemed to him that Zwingli held him by the hair of his head. When Samson appeared with his indulgences (in 1519), he again denounced him and his trade, and was supported in his opposition by the Bishop of Constance, to whom

[1] Christoffel, i. 24.

Samson had neglected to exhibit his credentials; so that the friar was denied permission to vend his wares in Zurich. Zwingli was a man of robust health, cheerful countenance and kindly manners, affable with all classes; a man of indefatigable industry, yet enjoying domestic life to the full — he was married in 1524 — and fond of spending an evening at the inn, in familiar conversation with magistrates or leading citizens, or with strangers who happened to be present.[1] Upright, humble before God, but fearless before men, devoted to the work of a preacher and pastor, but taking an active part in whatever concerned the well-being of his country, Zwingli acquired by degrees, though not without opposition and occasional exposure to extreme danger, a controlling influence in Zurich. A turning point in his career was the public Disputation, which was held at his own request, under the auspices of the government of Zurich, on the 29th of January, 1523, in the great Council Hall, where he had proposed to defend himself against all who chose to bring against him charges of heresy. He had really won the battle beforehand, in persuading the Council to take the part of judges, and, in the exercise of their authority, to have all questions decided by reference to the Scriptures alone. In an open space, in the midst of an assembly of more than six hundred men, he sat by a table, on which he had placed the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures and the Latin version. His triumphant maintenance of his opinions against his feeble assailants resulted in an injunction from the Council to persevere in preaching from the Scriptures alone, and a like command to all the clergy to teach nothing which the Scriptures do not warrant. In this conference he defended sixty-seven propositions which were leveled against the system of the Roman Catholic Church. The authority of the Gospel is substituted for the authority of the Church; the Church is declared to be the communion of the faithful, who have no head but Christ; salvation is through faith in Him as the only priest and intercessor; the Papacy and the mass, invocation of saints, justification by works, fasts, festivals, pilgrimages, monastic orders and the priesthood, auricular confession, absolution, indulgences,

[1] "Seriis et jocos miscuit et ludos: nam ingenio amoenus, et ore jucundus supra quam dici possit, erat. Dein musices omnis generis instrumenta perdidicit et exercuit, non nisi ut ingenio seriis illis defatigato et recreari et ad ea partior redire posset." Myconius, *Vita Huld. Zwinglii*, iii.

penances, purgatory, and indeed all the characteristic peculiarities of the Roman Catholic creed and cultus, are rejected. Jurisdiction over the authorities of the Church is claimed for the civil magistrates.[1] Again, in another disputation, before a much more numerous audience, on the 26th of October following, he obtained a decree of the Council against the use of images and the sacrifice of the mass. After a severe contest, he established the principle that the fasts of the Church are optional, not obligatory. In all the changes of this sort, radical as some of them were, extending even to the disuse of the organ in the minster, Zwingli proceeded temperately, with the same regard to weak consciences which Luther had shown, and taking care that everything should be done in an orderly manner, and by public authority. Like Luther, he found himself obliged to sustain a contest with Anabaptist enthusiasts. Zurich, separated from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constance, became a Church, at the head of which were the magistrates, who were proper representatives, in Zwingli's view, of the body of the congregation (1524).

In 1525 Zwingli published his principal work, the "Commentary on True and False Religion," which was dedicated to Francis I.; and, about the same time, a treatise on original sin. In these and other writings he set forth his theological system. This presented certain deviations at variance with Roman doctrine, to which he had arrived in his own reflections and reading. In most points he coincides with the usual Protestant doctrine, but, as will be explained, he departed farther from the old system in his conception of the sacraments; he ascribed to them a less important function; and he considered original sin a disorder rather than a state involving guilt.[2] It is remarkable that Zwingli in his philosophy was a predestinarian of an extreme type, and anticipated Calvinism in avowing the supralapsarian tenet; in this particular, going beyond Augustine. But he held that Christ has redeemed the entire race, which has been lost in Adam; and that infants, not only such as are unbaptized in Christian lands, but the offspring of the heathen, also, are all saved. Moreover, he did not accept the prevailing

[1] Zwingli, *Opera*, vii. Herzog, *Realencycl.*, art. "Zwingli," xviii. 716.

[2] His opinion on this subject varied somewhat at different times. See Zeller, *Das theol. Syst. Zwinglis dargestellt* (Abdruck aus Jahrg. 1853, *Theol. Jahrb.*), p. 51 seq.

belief in the universal condemnation of the heathen. The passages of Scripture which seem to assert this he regarded as intended to apply only to such as hear the Gospel and willfully reject it. The divine election and the illumination of the Spirit are not confined, he thought, within the circle of revealed religion, or to those who receive the Word and sacraments. The virtues of heathen sages and heroes are due to divine grace. By grace they were led to exercise faith in God. A Socrates, he says, was more pious and holy than all Dominicans and Franciscans. On the catalogue of saints with the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament he associates, besides Socrates, the names of the Scipios, Camillus, the Catos, Numa, Aristides, Seneca, Pindar, even Theseus and Hercules.[1] The influence of Zwingli's Humanistic culture is obvious in this portion of his teaching. "He had busied himself," says Neander, "with the study of antiquity, for which he had a predilection, and had not the right criterion for distinguishing the ethical standing-point of Christianity from that of the ancients." [2]

From Zurich the Reformation spread. In Basel it had for a leader Œcolampadius, who had belonged to the school of Erasmus, was an erudite scholar of mild temper, and in his general tone resembled Melancthon. In that city it gained the upper hand in 1529. In Berne it was established after a great public disputation, at which Zwingli was present, in 1528. The same change took place in St. Gall and Schaffhausen.

This ecclesiastical revolution was at the same time a political one. There was a contest between the republican and reforming party, on the one hand, who were bent on purifying the country from the effects of foreign influence, from the corruption of morals and of patriotism which had resulted from that source, and an oligarchy, on the other, who clung to their pensions and to the system of mercenary service with which their power was connected. The party of Zwingli were contending for a

[1] *Fidei Expositio, Opera*, iv. 65. "Non fuit vir bonus, non erit mens sancta non fidelis anima, ab ipso mundi exordio usque ad ejus consummationem, quem non sis isthic cum Deo visurus."

[2] *Dogmengeschichte*, ii. 263. On this topic Neander has written an able discussion: *Über das Verhältniss d. hellenischen Ethik zur Christlichen;* Wissenchaftl. Abhandlungen, p. 140. It had not been uncommon for the strictest Roman Catholics to believe in the salvation of Aristotle. Of Zwingli, Henri Martin says (*Histoire de France*, viii. 156): "On peut considérer l'œuvre de Zuingli comme le plus puissant effort qui été fait pour sanctifier la Renaissance et l'unir a la Réforme en Jésus Christ."

social and national reform on a religious foundation. They aimed to make the Gospel not only a source of light and life to the individual, but a renovating power in the body politic, for effecting the reform of the social life and of the civil organization of the country.

We have now to consider the relation of the Lutheran and Zwinglian movements to one another. There were great differences between the two leaders. Luther had, so to speak, lived into the system of the Latin Church to a degree that was not true in the case of Zwingli. Out of profound agitation, through long mental struggles, in which he depended little on aid or direction from abroad, Luther had come out of the old system. It was a process of personal experience with which his intellectual enlightenment kept pace. One truth, that of salvation by faith, in contrast with salvation by the merit of works, stood prominently before the eyes of Luther. The method of forgiveness, of reconciliation with God, had been with him, from his early youth, the one engrossing problem. The relation of the individual to God had absorbed his thoughts and moved his sensibilities to the lowest depths. The renunciation of the authority of the Church was an act to which nothing would have driven him but the force of his convictions respecting the central truth of justification by faith alone. The course of Zwingli's personal development had been different. Of cheerful temper and fond of his classics, he had felt no inclination to the monastic life. He came out of the Erasmian school. The authority of the Church never had a very strong hold upon him, even before he explicitly questioned the validity of it. As he studied the Scriptures and felt their power, he easily gave to them the allegiance of his mind and heart. It cost him little inward effort to cast off whatever in the doctrinal or ecclesiastical system of the Latin Church appeared to him at variance with the Bible or with common sense. In the mind there was no hard conflict with an established prejudice. It would be very unjust to deny to Zwingli religious earnestness; but the course of his inward life was such that, although he heartily accepted the principle of justification by faith, he had not the same vivid idea of its transcendent importance that Luther had. Zwingli, a bold and independent student, took the Bible for his chart, and was deterred by no scruples of latent reverence

from abruptly discarding usages which the Bible did not sanction. While Luther was disposed to leave untouched what the Bible did not prohibit, Zwingli was more inclined to reject what the Bible did not enjoin. Closely related to this difference in personal character is the very important diversity in the aims of the two reformers. Luther was practical, in one sense of the term; he sympathized with the homely feelings, as he was master of the homely language, of the people. No man knew better how to reach their hearts. He was a German who was inspired with a national sentiment, and indignantly resented the wrongs inflicted upon his country. But his aim was throughout a distinctly religious one. He drew a sharp line between the function which he conceived to belong to him, as a preacher and theologian, and the sphere of political action. Absorbed in the truth which he considered the life and soul of the Gospel and intent upon propagating it, he had no special aptitude for the organization of the Church: much less did he meddle with the affairs of civil government, except in the character of a minister, to enjoin obedience to established authority. Zwingli's aim and work were so diverse, his turn of mind and his circumstances being so different, that Luther and the other Saxon theologians were slow in understanding him and in doing justice to him.[1] Zwingli was a patriot and a social reformer. The salvation of his country from misgovernment and immorality was an end, inseparable, in his mind, from the effort to bring individuals to the practical acceptance of the Gospel.[2] The Swiss people must be lifted up from their degeneracy; and the instrument of doing this was the truth of the Bible, to be applied not only to the individual in his personal relations to God, but also to correct abuses in the social and civil life of the nation. These grew out of selfishness, and there was no cure for that save in the Word of God. After Zwingli renounced the Pope's pension, and declined his flattering offer to make it larger, and took his stand against foreign influence, come from what quarter it might, which attained its ends at the cost of national

[1] There is an excellent essay by Hundeshagen, *Zur Characteristik Ulrich Zwinglis u seines Reformationswerkes unter Vergleichung mit Luther und Calvin. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1862, 4.

[2] Of his attack upon the system of pensions, his friend Myconius says: "Hunc videbat tunc demum doctrinæ cœlesti locum futurum, ubi fons malorum esset exhaustus omnium." — *Vita Zwinglii*, iv.

corruption, he resembled in his position, in his mingled patriotism and piety, the old Hebrew prophets. "The Cardinal of Sitten," he said, "with right wears a red hat and cloak; you have only to wring them and you will behold the blood of your nearest kinsmen dripping from them!" He would have the Swiss abstain from all these dishonorable, pernicious alliances.

The question of priority as to time between Luther's movement and that of Zwingli has often been discussed. Zwingli asserted with truth that his opinions concerning the authority of the Scriptures and the method of salvation were formed independently of the influence of Luther. It is true that, independently of Luther, Zwingli, as early as 1518, preached against the sale of indulgences. But the expressions of Zwingli on these topics were such as might be heard elsewhere from other good men. In this matter he had the support of the Bishop of Constance, and did not incur the displeasure of Leo X., who had, perhaps, learned moderation from the occurrences in Saxony. The great point in Luther's case was his collision with the authority of the Church. It is justly claimed for Luther that he broke the path in this momentous and perilous conflict. When Luther was put under the ban of the Church, Zwingli was still the recipient of a pension from the Pope. When Luther at Worms, in the face of the German Empire, refused to submit to the authority of Pope or Council, Zwingli had not yet been seriously attacked. As late as 1523 he received a complimentary letter from Pope Adrian VI. Zwingli from the beginning was treated with the utmost forbearance, from the concern of the papal court for its political and selfish interests. These circumstances involve nothing discreditable to Zwingli, when the whole history of his relations to the Papacy is understood. But they demonstrate that the distinction of sounding the trumpet of revolt against the Roman See belongs to the Saxon reformer. Luther's voice, which was heard in every country of Europe, reached the valleys of Switzerland. It was then that Zwingli was charged by his enemies with being a follower of Luther. This he denied, at the same time that he avowed his agreement with Luther in the great points of doctrine, and courageously spoke of him in terms of warm praise. But it was the noise of the battle which Luther was waging that opened the eyes of men to the real drift of Zwingli's teaching.

An unhappy event for the cause of the Reformation was the outbreaking of the great controversy between the Lutherans and the Swiss upon the Eucharist. In 1524, at the very time when the division of Germany into two hostile parties, Protestant and Catholic, was taking place, and an armed conflict was impending, the evangelical forces were weakened by this intestine conflict.[1] The doctrine of transubstantiation is not a doctrine of the ancient Church. The view of Augustine, which was that a spiritual power is imparted to the bread and wine, analogous to the virtue supposed to inhere in the baptismal water, long prevailed in the Latin Church, even after the more extreme opinion had been broached by John of Damascus and the Greek theologians. This is evident from the effect that was produced when literal transubstantiation, or the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, was advocated in the ninth century by Radbert, the Abbot of Corvey. This theory was opposed by his contemporaries, Rabanus Maurus and by Ratramnus, who adhered to the views of Augustine. The bread and wine nourish the body, but the spiritual power imparted to them — the spiritual body of Christ, of which they are the sign — is received by faith and nourishes the soul to an immortal life. In the eleventh century, the view of Radbert had so far gained the ascendency that Berengar, who defended the more ancient theory, was condemned, although it was claimed that his opinion was favored by Hildebrand. Transubstantiation, the change of substance, was defended by the leading schoolmen of the thirteenth century, and was made an article of faith by the fourth Lateran Council, in 1215, under Innocent III.

The Reformers, with one accord, denied this dogma, together with the associated doctrine of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. But in other respects they were not agreed among themselves. Luther affirmed the actual, objective presence of the glorified body and blood of Christ, in connection with the bread and wine, so that the body and blood, in some mysterious way, are received by the communicant whether he be a believer or not. It is the doctrine of two substances in the sacrament, or what is often styled consubstantiation. His doctrine included a belief in the ubiquity of the human nature of the

[1] Ranke, *Deutsch. Gsch.* ii. 59.

ascended Christ. Zwingli, on the contrary, had come to consider the Lord's Supper as having principally a mnemonic significance, as a symbol of the atoning death of Christ and a token or pledge — as a ring would be a pledge — of its continual efficacy.[1] He is present to the contemplative faith of the communicant. A middle view, which was that of Calvin, though suggested by others before him, was that of a real but spiritual reception of Christ, by the believer alone, whereby there is implanted in the soul the germ of a glorified body or form of being like that of Christ. In this view the elements are the symbol, the pledge, or authentication of the grace of God through the death of Christ, and at the same time to the believer, though to no other, Christ is himself mysteriously and spiritually imparted, as the power of a new life — the power of resurrection. From the human nature of Christ, which is now exalted to heaven, or from his flesh, there enters into the soul of the believer a life-giving influence, so that he is united in the most intimate union to the Saviour.[2]

The vehemence of Luther's hostility to the Zwinglian doctrine is manifest in his correspondence for a considerable period after the rise of the controversy. There were no terms of opprobrium too violent for him to apply at times to the tenet and

[1] This idea of a token or pledge, however, he soon dropped. Mörikofer, ii. 197.

[2] Luther did not hold that the heavenly body of Christ, which is offered and received in the sacrament, occupies space. Yet it is received by all who partake of the bread and wine — not a portion of the body, but the entire Christ by each communicant. It is received, in some proper sense, with the mouth. Sometimes he uses crass expressions on this point. See, for example, the instructions to Melancthon for the conference with Bucer at Cassel: "Und ist summa das unser Meinung, dass wahrhaftig in und mit dem Brod der Leib Christi gessen wird, also dass alles, was des Brod wirket und leidet, der Leib Christi wirke und leide, das er ausgetheilt, gessen, und mit den Zöhnen zubissen werde." De Wette, iv. 572. He asserts that the body of Christ is *substantialiter* but not *localiter* — as extended or occupying space — present. De Wette, iv. 573. Zwingli, on the contrary, denied that the body of Christ is present, in any sense, in the sacrament. Thus he writes to Luther himself (April, 1527: *Zwing. Opera*, viii. 89): "Nunquam enim aliud obtinebis, quam quod Christi Corpus quum in cœna cuum in mentibus piorum non aliter sit, quam sola contemplatione." Zwingli and his followers were more and more disposed to attach importance to a *spiritual* presence of Christ in the sacrament. This Calvin emphasized and added the positive assertion of a direct influence upon the believing communicant, which flows from Christ through the medium or instrumentality of his human nature. His flesh and blood, though locally separated, are really imparted to the soul of the believer, as an effect of his faith, by "the secret power of the Holy Spirit." *Institutes*, iv. xvii. 9, 10, 23. An able historical discussion by Julius Müller, entitled *Vergleichung der Lehren Luthers und Calvins über den h. Abendmahl*, is in Müller's *Dogmatische Abhandlungen*, pp. 404–467.

the persons of the Sacramentarians. There were times when for special reasons — chiefly from the hope that they were coming over to his opinion — his hostility was sensibly abated. But his abhorrence of the Zwinglian doctrine never left him. The reasons that misled him into what struck those who differed from him as an intolerant and uncharitable course of conduct it is not impossible to discover. The obnoxious theory was first proposed by Carlstadt, an enthusiast and fanatic who had given Luther infinite trouble, and it was defended by him through a weak device of exegesis. It was associated in Luther's mind with the extreme spiritualism, or the subjective tendency, which undervalued and tended to sweep away the objective means of grace, the Word as well as the sacraments, and to substitute for them a special illumination or inspiration from the Spirit.[1] The Word and the Sacraments Luther had made the criteria of the Church. On upholding them in their just place, everything that distinguished his reform from enthusiasm or rationalism depended. He had never thought of forsaking the dogmatic system of Latin Christianity in its earlier and purer days, and he looked with alarm on what struck him as a visionary or rationalistic innovation. Besides, over and above all these considerations, the real objective presence of Christ in his human nature, was a belief that had taken a deep hold of his imagination and feelings. He had been tempted to give to the text — "this is my body" — a looser, more figurative meaning; but the text, he declared, was too strong for him. He must take it just as it reads. The truth is that his religious feelings were intertwined with the literal interpretation. Being immovably and on such grounds established in his opinion, he would have no fellowship with such as rejected it. They denied, as he considered, an article of the Christian faith,

[1] Luther was in the habit of stigmatizing the Zwinglians as "schwärmer." This seems at first inapposite, even as a term of opprobrium. But Luther would hold fast to the *objective* Word and the *objective* sacraments. As the truth was in the Word when it entered the ear even of the unbeliever; as it was the Word of God, however it might be received; so was Christ in the sacramental elements, whatever the beliefs or feelings of the recipient might be. The sacrament was complete, independently of the character of the recipient, not less than of the character of the minister. It owed its completeness to the divine institution: just as the rays of the sun are the same, whether they fall upon the eye that can see or upon the blind. In a word, Luther felt strongly that the Zwinglians attributed too much to the subjective factor, to faith, and thus sacrificed the grand objective character of the means of grace — doing by the sacraments what the enthusiasts did by the Scriptures.

a precious fact of Christian experience. The union of the believer with Christ — the *unio mystica* — is a theme on which he has written more impressively, perhaps, than upon any other topic of Christian doctrine.[1] Philosophical objections counted for nothing with him against the intuitions of the ethical or religious nature. He was profoundly sensible that the truths of religion transcend the limits of the understanding. Difficulties raised by the mere understanding, in however plausible form they might be presented, he considered to be really superficial. Yet, in defending his own view he sometimes condescended to fight with weapons of philosophy which he had drawn in earlier days from the tomes of Occam.

Of course the most urgent exertions would be made to heal a schism that threatened to breed great disasters to the Protestant cause. Not only was it a scandal of which the Roman Catholic party would only be too happy to make an abundant use, but it distracted the counsels and tended to paralyze the physical strength of the Protestant interest. The theologian who was most industrious in the work of bringing about a union, was Martin Bucer, who from his position at Strasburg was well situated with reference to both of the contending parties, and who was uncommonly ingenious at framing compromises, or at devising formulas sufficiently ambiguous to cover dissonant opinions. Rude and violent though Luther sometimes was, he was always utterly honest and outspoken, and for this reason proved on some occasions unmanageable; and Zwingli, earnest as was his desire for peace, was too sincere and self-respecting to hide his opinion under equivocal phraseology. At least, when it was openly attacked, he would as openly stand for its defense. Of the princes who were active in efforts to pacify the opposing schools and bring them upon some common ground, Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse, was the most conspicuous. The most memorable attempt of this sort was the conference at Marburg in 1529, where the Swiss theologians met Luther and Melancthon. The former accommodated themselves to the views of the Lutherans on the subject of original sin, and on some other points respecting which their orthodoxy had been questioned. The only point of difference was the Eucharist; but here

[1] Passages from Luther on this subject may be read in Dorner, *Entwickelungsgesch. d. Lehre v. d. Person Christ.*, ii. 510 seq.

the difference proved irreconcilable. The Landgrave arranged that private conferences should first be held between Œcolampadius and Luther, and between Melancthon and Zwingli; Zwingli and Luther being thus kept apart, and each put by the side of a theologian of mild and conciliatory temper. But the experiment was fruitless. No more could an agreement be reached when all were assembled with the Landgrave and a select company of spectators. The theologians sat by a table, the Saxons on one side and the Swiss opposite them. Luther wrote with chalk on the table his text — "hoc est meum corpus" — and refused to budge an iota from the literal sense. But his opponents would not admit the actual presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament, or that his body is received by unbelievers. The citations of Zwingli in answer to Luther's iteration of his solitary proof-text were numerous and apposite — "I am the true vine," etc. Finally, when it was evident that no common ground could be reached, Zwingli, with tears in his eyes, offered the hand of fraternal fellowship to Luther. But this Luther refused to take, not willing, says Ranke, to recognize them as of the same communion. But more was meant by this refusal; Luther would regard the Swiss as friends, but such was the influence of his dogmatic system over his feelings that he could not bring himself to regard them as Christian brethren. He said, "You have not the same spirit as ours." Luther and Melancthon at this time appear to have supposed that agreement in every article of belief is the import and necessary condition of Christian fellowship. Both parties engaged to be friendly to one another, and to abstain from irritating and abusive language, which had been a source of offense to both in the debates. They dined together in a friendly spirit with the Landgrave in the castle. They signed in common fourteen articles of faith relating to the great points of Christian doctrine, and promised to exercise toward one another all the charity which is consistent with a good conscience.[1] Luther in his journey homeward was cast down in spirit, and himself — as Zwingli had done — shed tears. In his heart there was a fountain of tenderness that was never wholly dry. There was a considerable time during which the sentiments and language

[1] Interesting details of the Conference may be read in Simpson's *Life of Zwingli*, p. 188 seq.; also, in Jackson, *Huldreich Zwingli*, p. 306 seq. (1901).

of Luther in relation to the Sacramentarians were greatly softened. In particular was this the case while he was at Coburg during the sessions of the Diet of Augsburg. The imperial cities of Southern Germany, by the agency of the indefatigable Bucer, although they sympathized with the Zwinglian doctrine, were admitted to the league of Smalcald. In 1536 the most distinguished theologians of Upper Germany joined Luther and his followers in subscribing to the Wittenberg Concord, which expressed, with slight reservations, the Lutheran view. But the Swiss adherents of Zwingli refused to sanction this Creed.[1] In 1543 the publication of Zwingli's writings by his son-in-law, Gualter, with an apologetic essay from his pen, once more roused the ire of Luther, and he began again to denounce the Zwinglians and their doctrine in the former vituperative strain.[2]

We now turn to the catastrophe of the Swiss Reformation. There was a growing hostility between the five mountain cantons that remained Catholic and the cities in which Protestant-

[1] It is asserted that the body and blood of Christ are truly present, and offered in the sacrament, and are received even by the "unworthy." Bucer distinguished between the "unworthy" and "godless." On this agreement see the article, "Wittenberger Concordie," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, and Gieseler, III. iv. 1, § 7.

[2] The story that Luther, shortly before his death, acknowledged to Melancthon that he had gone too far in the sacramental controversy, is given, for example, by Christoffel, i. 331. It is a fiction: see Galle, *Versuch einer Characteristik Melancthons als Theologen*, etc., p. 433. Luther and Melancthon depended very much for their information on Swiss affairs upon travelers and students, and had an imperfect conception of the real character of Zwingli's services to reform. Neither of the disputants at Marburg fully grasped the opinion of the other. The Zwinglians often understood Luther to hold to a local presence, whereas the Lutheran doctrine rests upon the idea of a spiritualizing of the human nature of Christ, of an effect wrought upon it by its relation to Divinity, so that it no longer fills space or is fettered by spatial relations. The state of Luther's health, and the particular circumstances under which he wrote, affected his tone respecting Zwingli. There was a certain bluntness in Zwingli which was offensive to Luther, and was interpreted by him as personal disrespect. Zwingli's letter to Luther (April, 1527; *Zwing. Opera*, viii. 39), however it may have been provoked, was adapted to irritate the Saxon reformer. Referring to it, Luther speaks of the "Helvetica ferocia" of his opponent (to Spalatin, May 31, 1527; De Wette, iii. 182). In a letter to Bullinger (May 14, 1538; De Wette, v. 3), he speaks kindly of Zwingli: "Libere enim dicam; Zwinglium, postquam Marpurgi mihi visus et auditus est, virum optimum esse judicavi, sicut et Œcolampadium," etc. He speaks of the grief he had experienced at Zwingli's death. But when his displeasure was excited, he wrote in a different spirit. See, for example, a letter to Wenc. Link (January 3, 1532; De Wette, iv. 331). But Zwingli, in the *Fidei Ratio*, — the creed which he presented at Augsburg, — had described Luther's opinion as the tenet of those "who look back to the flesh-pots of Egypt": "Qui adollas Ægyptiacas respectant" — an aspersion as unjust as it was irritating (*Rat. Fid.*, 8). Luther's latest ebullition, occasioned by the intelligence that the Swiss were denouncing him, is in a letter to Jac. Probst (January 17, 1546; De Wette, v. 777.)

ism had been established. The Protestant cause was making progress in other parts of Switzerland. The Catholic cantons entered into a league with Ferdinand of Austria. Protestant preachers who fell into the hands of the Catholics were put to death. The new doctrine was suppressed within their limits. The districts that belonged in common to the several cantons furnished the occasion for bitter controversy. At length Zurich took up arms, and without bloodshed forced the five cantons to tear up the compact with Austria, to concede that each government should be free to decide for itself upon the religious question, and to pay the costs of the projected war. Peace was concluded when both parties were in the field, face to face. The behavior of the five cantons, however, was not improved. Their threatening attitude led Zurich to form alliances with the city of Strasburg and the Landgrave of Hesse. The force of the Protestants, apart from foreign help, was greater than that of their adversaries. Zwingli recommended bold measures. He thought that the constitution of the Swiss Confederacy should be changed, so that the preponderance might be given to the cities where it justly belonged, and taken from the mountain districts which had so shamefully misused their power. The chief demands that were really made, were that the Protestant doctrine, which was professed in the lower cantons, should be tolerated in the upper, and that persecution should cease there. But the question was whether even these demands would be enforced. Zwingli with reason distrusted the pledges of the Catholic cantons, and was in favor of overpowering the enemy by a direct attack, and of extorting from them just concessions. But he was overruled, and half-measures were resorted to. The attempt was made to coerce the Catholic cantons by non-intercourse, thus cutting off their supplies. The effect was that the Catholics were enabled to collect their strength, while the Protestant cities were divided by jealousies and by disagreement as to what might be the best policy to adopt. Zurich was left without help to confront, with hasty and inadequate preparation, the combined strength of the Catholic party. The Zurich force was defeated at Cappel, on the 11th of October, 1531, and Zwingli, who had gone forth as a chaplain with his people to battle, fell. He had anticipated defeat from the time when his counsels were disregarded, and he had found it impossible

to bring the magistrates of Berne to a resolution to act with decision. In the thick of the fight, he raised his voice to encourage his companions, but made no use of his weapons.[1] As he received his mortal wound, he exclaimed: "What evil is this? they can kill the body, but not the soul!" [2] As he lay, still breathing, on the field, but with his hands folded and his eyes directed to heaven, one or more brutal soldiers asked him to confess to a priest, or to call on Mary and the saints. He shook his head in token of refusal. They knew not to whom they were speaking, but only that he was a heretic, and with a single sword-thrust put an end to his life.[3] Notwithstanding this defeat, the party of the reformed might have retrieved their cause. But they lacked union and energy. Zurich and Berne concluded a humiliating peace, the effect of which was to inflict a serious check upon the Protestant interest and to enable the Catholics to repossess themselves of portions of the ground which they had lost.

The menace addressed by the Catholic majority at the Diet of Augsburg to the Protestants led to the formation of the Protestant Defensive League of Smalcald, to which the four imperial cities of South Germany that held the Zwinglian opinions, but were now disconnected from the confederacy of their Swiss brethren, were admitted in 1531. The Imperial Chamber had been purged by the exclusion of all who were supposed to sympathize with the new opinions. This tribunal was to be made the instrument of a legal persecution. The Emperor procured the election of his brother as Roman King, in a manner which involved a violation of the rights of the Electors, and was adapted to excite the apprehensions of the Protestants.[4] The Wittenberg theologians waived their opposition to the project of withstanding the Emperor. Luther took the ground that, while as Christians, they ought not to resort to force, yet the rights and duties of the princes in reference to the Emperor were a political question for jurists to determine, and that Christians,

[1] Mörikofer, ii. 417. [2] Myconius, xii.

[3] The death of Zwingli is described with touching simplicity by his successor at Zurich, Bullinger, *Reformationsgeschichte* (Zurich ed., 1838), iii. 136.

[4] Ranke, iii. 220 seq. The "King of the Romans" was the title of the successor of the Emperor during the lifetime of the latter, and of the latter prior to his coronation at Rome. See Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 404.

as members of the state, were bound to take up arms in defense of their princes, when these are unlawfully assaulted. The political situation for ten years after the Diet of Augsburg was such as not only to disable Charles from the forcible execution of its decree, but also such as to favor the progress of the Reformation. The League of Smalcald, strengthened by a temporary alliance with the Dukes of Bavaria and by treaties with France and Denmark, was too formidable to be attacked. The irruption of the Turks under Soliman was another insuperable obstacle in the way of the repressive policy. Hence, in 1532, "the peace of Nuremberg" provided that religious affairs should be left unchanged, until they could be adjusted by a new Diet, or by a new Council. Such a Council the Protestants had demanded at Augsburg and Charles had promised to procure. Notwithstanding the disturbance produced by the Anabaptist communists at Münster, the Reformation advanced with rapid strides. The Protestant Duke of Würtemberg was reëstablished in his possessions by the Landgrave of Hesse, in 1534. Brandenburg and ducal Saxony, by the death of the Elector and of the Duke, became Protestant. Catholic princes were beginning to grant religious liberty to their subjects. The war with France, which broke out in 1536, rendered it impossible for the Emperor to hinder this progress. The Smalcald League was extended by the accession of more princes and cities. The Protestants refused to comply with the summons to a Council, in which, by the terms of the invitation, their condemnation was a foregone conclusion. Alarmed at the growing strength of Protestantism, the leading Catholic estates united in a Holy League at Nuremberg, in 1538, which, like the League of Smalcald, was ostensibly for defense.[1] The next

[1] The cause of the Reformation was weakened by the discord of Protestant princes, especially of the Elector and Duke Maurice. It suffered still more in consequence of the "dispensation" which Luther and Melancthon granted the Landgrave of Hesse, which allowed him to contract a second marriage without being divorced from his wife, who had become repugnant to him on account of her bodily disorders and personal habits. To this plan his wife consented. As they ceased to live together, the conscience of Philip was worried by his yielding to sensual temptation. Both Luther and Melancthon had held that polygamy was not absolutely — with no exception — forbidden in the New Testament. They agreed, and Bucer with them concurred, under the circumstance, in approving of the second marriage of the Landgrave without a divorce. It must be treated as an exception to the rule and kept a secret. Luther regarded his relation to the fact as the same as that of a priest in the confessional, bound not to reveal what he learns there. Philip, he held, was under an equal obligation not

three years are marked by efforts to secure peace, of which the Conference and Diet of Ratisbon, in 1541, is the most remarkable. On this occasion the Pope was represented by his Legate, Contarini, who held a view of justification not dissimilar to that of the Protestants, and was ready to meet Melancthon halfway on the path of concession. In these negotiations an actual agreement was attained in the statement of four doctrinal points, which embraced the subjects of the nature of man, original sin, redemption, and justification; but upon the Church, sacraments, and kindred topics, it was found that no concord was attainable. The King of France, from the selfish purpose to thwart the effort for union, with others on the Catholic side who were actuated by different motives, complained of the concessions that had been made by the Catholic party; and Contarini was checked by orders from the Pope. The Elector of Saxony was equally dissatisfied with the proceedings of Melancthon, and together with Luther, who regarded the hope of a compromise as wholly futile, and as inspired by Satan, was gratified when the abortive conference was brought to an end. The necessity of getting help at once against the Turks compelled Charles once more to sanction the peace of Nuremberg with additional provisions to the advantage of the Protestants. His unsuccessful expedition against Algiers, in 1541, and the renewed war with France, together with the Turkish war in which his brother Ferdinand was involved, obliged the latter, at a Diet at Spires in 1542, to grant a continuance of the religious peace. The imperial declaration at Ratisbon was ratified by the Diet of Spires, held in 1544. The prospects of the Protestant cause had been bright. For a time it seemed probable

to disclose the fact. Margaret whom he married was his "wife before God and not before the world." Luther did not adopt the "mental reservation" theory of Roman casuists, or the theory of "venial" sins. This "double marriage" brought reproach upon the reformers and carried with it political consequences that were disastrous. Melancthon himself, after the secret nuptials, was a prey to anxiety, and, at Weimar, was attacked with illness so severe that his recovery was due to Luther's energetic sympathy. See Ranke, iv. 186 seq. Unfounded charges against Luther in connection with this unhappy event, by Protestant as well as Catholic writers, — for example, that he was actuated by a selfish regard for the interests of the Protestant party; that he was in favor of polygamy, etc., — are exposed by Hare, *Vindication of Luther*, etc., p. 225 seq. The transaction is fully narrated by Seckendorf, iii. sect. 21, lxxix. See, also, Rommel, *Philip d. Grossmüthige*, i. 436, ii. 409. Full statements of the historical facts are given in Prussian *State Archives*, 5th vol.; *Correspondence of Philip with Bucer;* and, especially, by W. W. Rockwell, *Die Doppelehe des Landgrafen Philipp* (1904).

that all Germany would adopt the new faith. But the League of Smalcald was grievously weakened by internal dissension. The cities complained of arbitrary proceedings of the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse; for example, in the expulsion of the Duke of Brunswick from his land, a measure that brought them into conflict with the imperial court. But the fatal event was the hostility of Maurice, Duke of Saxony, to the Elector, which rested on various grounds, and which had once before brought them to the verge of war; and the abandonment of the League by Maurice, in 1542. He had married the daughter of Philip of Hesse, but he wanted to enlarge his territory, and he coveted the title and rank of his neighbor and cousin. His interest in the Lutheran cause was more than balanced by his hope of advantage from the friendship of Charles. The Elector of Brandenburg had not joined the League, and was followed in this course by the old Elector Palatine, who adopted the Reformation in 1545. The Emperor forced France to conclude the peace of Crespy, in 1544. At the Diet of Worms in March, 1545, the Protestants refused to take part in the Council of Trent. The hostility of the Elector to Maurice prevented the formation of a close alliance between the two Saxonies and Hesse. Maurice, so adroit and aspiring a politician, loving power more than he valued his faith, at length made his bargain with Charles, and engaged to unite with him in making war upon the Elector, whose territories Maurice coveted, and upon the Landgrave, the two princes whom the Emperor professed to attack, not on religious grounds, but as offenders against the laws and peace of the Empire. While the Emperor was dallying with the Protestants that he might prepare to strike a more effective blow, Luther died at Eisleben, the place of his birth, on the 18th of February, 1546. His last days were not his best. His health was undermined, and he suffered grievously from various disorders, especially from severe, continuous headache. He was oppressed with a great variety of little employments relating to public and private affairs, so that going one day from his writing table to the window he fancied that he saw Satan mocking him for having to consume his time in useless business.[1] His intellectual powers were not enfeebled.

[1] "Here to-day have I been pestered with the knaveries and lies of a baker brought before me for using false weights; though such matters concern the magistrate rather than the divine. Yet, if no one were to check the thefts of these bakers, we should have a fine state of things." — *Tischreden.*

His religious trust continued firm as a rock. His courage and his assurance of the ultimate victory of the truth never faltered. But he lost the cheerful spirits, the joyous tone, that had before characterized him. He took dark views of the wickedness of the times and of society about him. He was weary of the world, weary of life, and longed to be released from its burdens. He was old, he said, useless, a cumberer of the ground, and he wanted to go. His disaffection with Wittenberg, on account of what he considered the laxness of family government and reprehensible fashions in respect to dress, was such that he determined to quit the place, and he was dissuaded only by the united intercessions of the Elector, and of the authorities of the University and of the town. He fell into a conflict with the jurists on account of their declaration that the consent of parents is not absolutely indispensable to the validity of a marriage engagement, and he attacked them publicly from the pulpit.[1]

The friendship of Luther and Melancthon was not broken, but partially chilled in consequence of theological differences. There were two points on which Melancthon swerved from his earlier views. From the time of the controversy of Luther and Erasmus, Melancthon had begun to modify his ideas of predestination, and to incline to the view that was afterwards called Synergism, which gives to the will an active though a subordinate, receptive agency in conversion. On this subject, however, the practical, if not the theoretical, views of Luther were also modified, as is evident from the letters which he wrote in reply to perplexed persons who applied to him for counsel. The difference on this subject between him and Melancthon, if one existed, occasioned no breach. It was not until after Luther's death that his followers made this a ground of attack on Melancthon and the subject of a theological contest. But, on the Lord's Supper, the matter on which Luther was most sensitive, Melancthon's view, from about the time of the Diet of Augsburg, began to deviate from his former opinion. The spell which Luther had cast over him in his youth was broken; and, influenced by the arguments of Œco-

[1] Galle, p. 139. Luther writes to Spalatin that in his whole life and in all his labors for the Gospel, he had never had more anxiety than during that year (1544). De Wette, v. 626.

lampadius and by his own independent study of the Fathers, he really embraced, in his own mind, the Calvinistic doctrine, which was, in substance, the opinion advocated by Œcolampadius and Bucer. Melancthon still rejected the Zwinglian theory which made Christ in the sacrament merely the object of the contemplative act of faith; but the other hypothesis of a real but spiritual reception of Him, in connection with the bread and wine, satisfied him. Melancthon's reserve and anxiety to keep the peace could not wholly veil this change of opinion; and persons were not wanting, of whom Nicholas Amsdorf was the chief, to excite as far as they could, the jealousy and hostility of Luther. The result was that the confidential intimacy of the two men was interrupted. For several years Melancthon lived in distress and in daily expectation of being driven from his place.[1] "Often," he says, writing in Greek as he frequently did when he wanted to express something which he was afraid to divulge — "Often have I said that I dreaded the old age of a nature so passionate, like that of Hercules, or Philoctetes, or the Roman General, Marius." [2] In remarks of this sort he referred, as he explained later, to the vehemence common to men of a heroic make.[3] Yet, in previous years none had been more just and forbearing in reference to the undue tendency to concession and compromise on the part of Melancthon than Luther. For the change in their relations, the fear and consequent reserve and shyness of the one were not less responsible than the imperious disposition of the other. It would be a mistake to suppose that Luther lost his confidence and love towards his younger associate; for expressions of Luther, in his very last days, prove the contrary. It would be an error, likewise, to suppose that Melancthon ever came to regard him as other than one of the foremost of men, a hero, endowed with noble and admirable qualities of heart as well as mind. But the original contrariety in the temperament of the two men, joined to infirmities of character in Luther, which

[1] *Corpus Ref.*, v. 474. Galle, p. 142. A letter of Melancthon to Carlowitz, the Councilor of Duke Maurice (*Corpus Ref.*, vi. 879), written just after the close of the Smalcaldic War, in which he speaks of the φιλονεικία of Luther, affords proof of the uncomfortable relations in which he had stood with the strictly Lutheran Court of the Elector. This letter, which was written, says Ranke, at an unguarded moment, gave, under the circumstances, just offense to those who cherished the memory of Luther. See the remarks of Ranke, iv. 53.

[2] *Corpus Ref.*, v. 310. Galle, p. 140. [3] Galle, p. 149.

were aggravated by long years of strenuous combat and labor and by disease, had the effect to cloud for a while their mutual sympathy and cordiality of intercourse. But the great soul of Luther shines out in the last letters he wrote — several of them affectionate epistles to Melancthon — and in the last sermons he preached at Eisleben; where, within a few rods of the house in which he was born, full of faith and of peace, he breathed his last. "He is gone," said Melancthon to his students, "the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof, who ruled the Church in these last troubled times." In the course of the funeral address which Melancthon pronounced over the grave beneath the pulpit where the voice of Luther had so long been heard, he referred to the complaint made against Luther's excessive vehemence, and quoted the frequent remark of Erasmus, that "God has given to this last time, on account of the greatness of its diseases, a sharp physician." With grief and tears, he said, that choked his utterance, he set forth the grand labors of Luther, the kindness, geniality, and dignity of his character, his freedom from personal ambition, the wisdom and sobriety that were mingled with his irresistible energy as a reformer. If even in this address, and still more in subsequent letters of Melancthon, traces of a partial estrangement may be detected in his tone, the effect is only a discriminating instead of a blind admiration of one with whom he was connected by an indissoluble bond of love.[1]

Luther, whatever deduction from his merit may be made on the score of faults and infirmities, was one of those extraordinary men of whom it may be said, in no spirit of hero-worship, but in sober truth, that their power, as manifested in history, can only be compared to that of the great permanent forces of nature. "He is one of those great historical figures in which whole nations recognize their own type." [2] A lifelong opponent of Protestantism, one of the first Roman Catholic scholars of the last century, said of him: "It was Luther's overpowering greatness of mind and marvelous many-sidedness which made him to be the man of his time and of his people; and it is correct to say that there never has been a German who has so intuitively understood his people, and in turn has been by the nation so perfectly comprehended, I might say, absorbed by it, as this

[1] Galle, pp. 144, 145. [2] Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theology*, i. 81.

Augustinian monk at Wittenberg. Heart and mind of the Germans were in his hand like the lyre in the hand of the musician. Moreover, he has given to his people more than any other man in Christian ages has ever given to a people: language, manual for popular instruction, Bible, hymns of worship; and everything which his opponents in their turn had to offer or to place in comparison with these, showed itself tame and powerless and colorless by the side of his sweeping eloquence. They stammered; he spoke with the tongue of an orator; it is he only who has stamped the imperishable seal of his own soul, alike upon the German language and upon the German mind; and even those Germans who abhorred him as the powerful heretic and seducer of the nation, cannot escape; they must discourse with his words, they must think with his thoughts." [1]

The Smalcaldic war began in 1546. Notwithstanding the disadvantageous situation of the Protestants, had the military management been good, they might have achieved success. But a spirit of indecision and inactivity prevailed. The Elector, John Frederic, drove from his territory the forces of Maurice, but was surprised, defeated, and captured by Charles at Mühlberg, on the 24th of April, 1547; and soon after the Landgrave surrendered himself and submitted to the Emperor. The victory of Charles appeared to be almost complete. His plan was to bring the Protestants once more under the Catholic hierarchy, and to make them content by the removal of external abuses. His estimate of the true character and moral strength of Protestantism was always superficial. Hence he put forth a provisional formula — called, after the sanction of it by the Diet, the Augsburg Interim — at the same time that a scheme for reformation was by his authority laid before the German bishops, in which changes were proposed in points of external order. The work which he had thus commenced he hoped that the Council of Trent would complete. But this plan, however promising it seemed to the Emperor, had to contend not only with the opposition of earnest Protestants, but also with the discordant ideas and projects of the Pope. Charles had counted upon suppressing Protestantism by the joint influence of his own power and that of the Council. But the

[1] Dollinger, *Vorträge*, etc. (Munich, 1872). See, also, his earlier work, *Kirche u. Kirchen* (1861), p. 386.

Council had begun its work, not with measures looking to a reformation, but with the condemnation of the Protestant doctrines. Moreover, Pope Paul III., although he hoped that benefit would result to the Church from the Smalcaldic war, dreaded a too absolute success on the part of Charles, which would render him dangerous in Italy. Hence he wished that the Elector might hold out against the Emperor, and sent a message to Francis I. to aid the former. He withdrew the ill-disciplined troops with which he had furnished Charles, and excited the Emperor's intense displeasure by removing the Council to Bologna. The Pope and Francis were once more closely allied, and at work on the Protestant side for the purpose of diminishing the power of Charles. The imperial bishops refused to leave Trent, and the Council was rendered powerless. The measures undertaken by Charles were, besides, considered by the Pope and by zealous Catholics to be an encroachment upon his spiritual authority, a usurpation of powers not belonging to a secular ruler. In Southern Germany the acceptance of the Interim was forced upon the Protestant states and cities. In Northern Germany it was generally resisted. The city of Magdeburg especially signalized itself by its persevering refusal to submit to the new arrangements. Duke Maurice modified the Interim, retaining the essential features of the Lutheran doctrine, but allowing Catholic rites and institutions, and thus framed the Leipsic Interim. This proceeding, which was accomplished by the aid of Melancthon and the other Wittenberg theologians, led to a bitter controversy in the Lutheran Church on the same question which came up elsewhere in connection with Puritanism, whether these obnoxious rites and usages might be adopted by the Church as things morally indifferent — adiaphora — when the magistrate enjoins them. Melancthon incurred the fierce hostility of the stricter Lutherans, and the controversy was of long continuance.[1]

The Council had been reassembled at Trent by Pope Julius III., who was wholly favorable to the Emperor. Protestant

[1] That Melancthon went too far in his concessions in the period of the Interim, is allowed by judicious friends of the Reformation. See Ranke, v. 48 seq. It should be remembered, however, in justice to him, that in signing the Smalcald Articles, he had appended the qualification that for himself he was willing, for the sake of unity, to admit a *jure humano* superiority of the Pope over other bishops. See the learned article "Melancthon," by Landerer, and Kirn in Hauck, *Realencyklopadie*, xii. 513.

states had entered into negotiations with it, and it seemed probable that Germany must bow to its authority, when the whole situation was turned by the bold movement of Duke Maurice for the rescue of the cause which he had been chiefly instrumental in crushing. Notwithstanding that Germany was in appearance well-nigh subjugated to the Emperor, there were powerful elements of opposition. The Turks had captured Tripoli from the Knights of St. John, and kindled anew the flames of war in Hungary. Henry VIII., the King of England, had died, and been succeeded by Edward VI., by whom Protestantism was established in that country. Henry II. of France was uniting with the enemies of the Emperor in Italy, and in September, 1551, hostilities once more commenced between the two rival powers. The heroic resistance of Magdeburg had stimulated the enthusiasm of the Protestants of North Germany. The project of Charles V. to make his son, Philip of Spain, his successor to the Empire, had even threatened for a time to produce an estrangement between the Emperor and Ferdinand. The German princes were offended at the preference given to Spanish advisers and at personal slights which they had suffered. The continued presence of foreign troops in violation of the Emperor's promise at his election was offensive to the nation. Maurice had become an object of general antipathy among those whom he had betrayed. Curses, loud as well as deep, were freely uttered against him. The sufferings of the good Elector, whom no threats and no bribes could induce to compromise his religious faith, and the continued imprisonment of the Landgrave against the spirit of the stipulations given on the occasion of his surrender, for the fulfillment of which Maurice was held to be answerable, were not only personally displeasing to him, but they brought upon him increasing unpopularity. His applications to the Emperor for the release of the Landgrave, Maurice's father-in-law, had proved ineffectual. The Spaniards were threatening that the German princes should be put down, and intimations that Maurice himself might have to be dealt with as the Elector had been were occasionally thrown out. The siege of Magdeburg which Maurice, who had undertaken to execute the imperial ban against that city, was languidly prosecuting served him as a cover for military preparations. Having secured the coöperation of several Protestant princes on whom

he could rely; having convinced with difficulty the families of the captive princes that he might be trusted; having, also, negotiated an alliance with Henry II., who was to make a diversion against Charles in the Netherlands; having come to an understanding with Magdeburg, which was to serve as a refuge in case of defeat; having made these and all other needful preparations with profound secrecy, he suddenly took the field, and marching at the head of an army which increased at every step of his advance, he crossed the Alps, and forced the Emperor, who was suffering from an attack of the gout, to fly from Innsbruck.[1] This triumph was followed by the treaty of Passau. Charles left his brother Ferdinand to negotiate with the princes. The demand of Maurice and of his associates was that the Protestants should have an assurance of toleration and of an equality of rights with the Catholics, whether the efforts to secure religious unanimity in the nation should succeed or not. To this Ferdinand gave his assent; but the Emperor, impelled alike by conscience and by pride, notwithstanding his humiliating defeat, could not be brought to concur in this stipulation. The Protestants obtained the pledge of amnesty, of peace, and equal rights, until the religious differences should be settled by a national assembly or a general council. The captive princes were set at liberty. Charles was obliged to see his long-cherished plan for the destruction of Protestantism terminate in a mortifying failure. At the Diet of Augsburg in 1555, the celebrated Religious Peace was concluded. Every prince was to be allowed to choose between the Catholic religion and the Augsburg Confession, and the religion of the prince was to be that of the land over which he reigned. The Catholics wanted to except ecclesiastical princes from the first article; the Protestants objected to the second. Finally the ecclesiastical reservation was adopted into the treaty, according to which every prelate on becoming Protestant should resign his benefice; and by an accompanying declaration of Ferdinand, the subjects of ecclesiastical princes were to enjoy religious liberty. The Imperial Chamber, which had been a principal instrument of oppression in the hands of the Catholics, was reconstituted in such a way that the rights of the Protestants were protected. Charles

[1] Maurice did not capture Charles: "He had no cage," he said, "for so large a bird." Charles fled from Innsbruck May 19, 1552.

took no part personally in the proceedings which led to the religious peace. It involved a concession to the adherents of the Augsburg Confession — the liberty to practice their religion without molestation or loss of civil privileges, whether a council should or should not succeed in uniting the opposing parties — a concession which he had intended never to grant. But the progress of thought and the strength of religious convictions were too mighty to be overcome by force. Mediæval imperialism was obliged to give way before the forces arrayed against it. The abdication of Charles, who felt himself physically unequal to the cares of his office, followed, and the imperial station devolved on his brother (1556).

Thus Protestantism obtained a legal recognition. During the next few years, the Protestant faith rapidly spread even in Bavaria and Austria. Had it not been for the Ecclesiastical Reservation, says Gieseler, all Germany would have soon become Protestant.[1]

[1] Gieseler, IV. i. 1, § 11.

CHAPTER VI

THE REFORMATION IN THE SCANDINAVIAN KINGDOMS, IN THE SLAVONIC NATIONS, AND IN HUNGARY

When we inquire into the means by which the German Reformation extended itself into the adjacent countries, the agency of the Germans who were settled in these lands constantly appears. One is reminded of the diffusion of the ancient Hebrews, and of the part taken by them in opening a way for Christianity beyond the bounds of Palestine. Another very conspicuous instrument in the spread of the Lutheran doctrine was Wittenberg, the renowned school to which young men were attracted out of all the neighboring lands. The use of Latin as a vehicle of teaching and as the common language of educated persons of whatever nationality rendered this practicable. But the Scandinavians were themselves a branch of the great Teutonic family, near kinsmen of the Germans, and connected with them, besides, by the bonds of commercial intercourse.

In 1397 the three Scandinavian kingdoms, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, were united by the Union of Calmar, in which it was provided that each nation should preserve its laws and institutions, and share in the election of the common sovereign. The result, however, was a long struggle for Danish supremacy over Sweden. When the Reformation in Germany began, Christian II. of Denmark was engaged in a contest for the Swedish throne. In all these countries the prelates were possessed of great wealth, and very much restricted the authority of the sovereign as well as the power of the secular nobles.[1]

Christian II. was surrounded, in Denmark, by a body of advisers who sympathized with the Lutheran movement in Saxony. He was himself disposed to depress the power of the

[1] Münter, *Kirchengeschichte v. Dänemark u. Norwegen*, Th. iii.; Gieseler, iv. i. c. 2, § 17; Geijer, *History of the Swedes;* J. Weidling, *Schwedische Geschichte im Zeitalter d. Ref.* (1882); A. C. Bang, *Den Norske Kirkes Historie* (1901); W. E. Collins, in *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 599 seq.

ecclesiastical and lay aristocracy, and, for this end, though not without the admixture of other and better motives, set to work to enlighten and elevate the lower classes. The encouragement of Protestantism accorded with his general policy. In 1520 he sent for a Saxon preacher to serve as chaplain at his court and as a religious instructor of the people, and subsequently invited Luther himself into his kingdom. He gained the upper hand in Sweden and was crowned at Stockholm, November 4, 1520. At the same time that Christian availed himself of the papal ban as a warrant for his tyranny and cruelty in Sweden, he continued in Denmark to promote the establishment of Protestantism. In 1521 he put forth a book of laws, which contained enactments of a Protestant tendency; among them one to encourage the marriage of all prelates and priests, and another for dispensing with all appeals to Rome.[1] After his sanguinary proceedings against Sweden, finding that his crown was in danger, he retracted his reformatory measures, at the instigation of a papal legate. But he was deposed by the prelates and nobles of Denmark, and his uncle, Frederic I., Duke of Schleswig and Holstein, was made king, in 1523.

Frederic at his accession, though personally inclined to Protestantism, was obliged to pledge himself to the Danish magnates to resist its introduction and to grant it no toleration. The exiled Christian identified himself with the Protestant cause, though not with constancy; for if the charge lacks proof that, at Augsburg, in 1530, in order to get the help of the Emperor, he formally abjured the evangelical faith, it is true that in 1531 he promised to uphold the Catholic Church in Norway. He rendered a good service by causing the New Testament to be translated into Danish, which was done by two of his nobles. The immediate occasion of the successful introduction of Lutheranism into Denmark was the active propagation of it in the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, where, in 1524, Frederic imposed mutual toleration on both parties. In Denmark itself the study of the Bible was encouraged, a Biblical theology was inculcated, and ecclesiastical abuses censured by a number of earnest preachers, among whom was Paul Eliä, of Helsingör, Provincial of the Carmelites, who worked with much effect in this direction, although at last, like Erasmus, he chose to abide in the old

[1] Münter, p. 56 seq.

Church, and even turned his weapons, with a bitter antipathy, against the Reformers. In 1526 the King declared himself in favor of the Reformation, the doctrine of which was disseminated rapidly in the cities. The most zealous advocate of the new doctrine was John Taussen, sometimes called the Danish Luther, who studied at Wittenberg, and after 1524, in defiance of the opposition of the bishops, preached Lutheranism with marked effect.[1] The Danish nobility were favorable to the King's side, from jealousy of the power of the prelates, and the desire to possess themselves of ecclesiastical property. At the Diet of Odense, in 1527, it was ordained that marriage should be allowed to the clergy, that Lutheranism should be tolerated, and that bishops should thenceforward abstain from getting the pallium from Rome, but, when chosen by the chapter, should look to the King alone for the ratification of their election. Converts to Lutheranism were made in great numbers. Wiborg in Jutland, and Malmö in Schonen, were the principal centers, whence the reformed faith was diffused over the kingdom. Books and tracts in exposition and defense of it, as well as the Bible in the vernacular tongue, were everywhere circulated. The Lutherans who, in 1530, presented their Confession of Faith in forty-three Articles, acquired the preponderance in the land; but in consequence of the pledges of Frederic at his accession, the bishops were not deprived of their power. His death, in 1533, led to a combined effort on their part to abrogate the recent ecclesiastical changes and restore the exclusive domination of the old religion. They accordingly refused to sanction the election of Christian III., Frederic's eldest son, who had been active in establishing Protestantism in the Duchies; until their consent was compelled by the attempt of the Count of Oldenburg, a Protestant, to restore the deposed Christian II., whom they still more feared and hated. By Christian III., whose admiration for Luther had been first kindled at the Diet of Worms, where this prince was present, the authority of the prelates was abolished, at a Diet at Copenhagen, in 1536, and the Reformation universally legalized. The bishops were forced to renounce their dignities. A constitution for the Danish Church was framed, and submitted to Luther for his sanction. Bugenhagen, a prominent friend of the Saxon Reformer, came into the kingdom, on the King's invi-

[1] Pontoppidan, *Annales Eccl. Dan.*, ii. 774.

tation, and, in 1537, crowned him and his Queen, and perfected the new ecclesiastical arrangements. Bishops, or superintendents, were appointed for the dioceses, and formally consecrated to their offices by Bugenhagen himself, "ut verus episcopus," as Luther expressed it. The University of Copenhagen was reorganized, and other schools of learning established in the various cities.

This final triumph of Protestantism in Denmark was connected with events of peculiar interest in the history of the Reformation.[1] The Lutheran doctrine had quickly penetrated into every place where the German tongue was spoken. The cities of Northern Germany, the members of the old Hanseatic league, gave it a hospitable reception. The strong burgher class in these towns lent a willing ear to the preachers from Wittenberg. The Hansa, at the period of its greatest prosperity, in the fourteenth century, comprised in its confederacy all the maritime towns of Germany, together with Magdeburg, Brunswick, and other intermediate places; and exerted a controlling influence in the Scandinavian kingdoms. It was weakened by the separation of the Netherlands, after 1427. The great value of the trade of the northern kingdoms, of the products of their mines and fisheries, made it of the highest importance to Lübeck, the leading city of the Hansa, to keep its commercial and political supremacy. Christian II., the brother-in-law of Charles V., was withstood in his attempt to subdue the northern nations by the Lübeckers, by whom Gustavus Vasa was assisted in gaining the throne of Sweden. The cities which, like Hamburg and Magdeburg, had a magistracy that was favorable to the Protestant doctrine, received the new system without any serious political disturbance. But in some other towns, as Bremen and Lübeck, the acceptance of Lutheranism was attended by changes in the government, which were effected by the burghers, and were democratic in their character. The new Burgomaster, at Lübeck, Wullenweber, whom the revolution had raised to power, negotiated a treaty of alliance with the English King, Henry VIII.; The great object of Lübeck was to keep the trade between the Baltic and the North Sea in its own hands. But the situation in Denmark, after the death of Frederic I., was such that Lübeck reversed its attitude and espoused the cause of the exiled King,

[1] See Ranke, *Deutsch. Gsch.*, iii. 270 seq., 406 seq.

Christian II. The Lübeckers found that they could not longer count upon the coöperation of Denmark in their commercial policy, and that Christian III., of Holstein, could not be enlisted in support of their hostile undertakings against Holland. Hence, they put forward the Count of Oldenburg as a champion of the banished sovereign. Malmö, Copenhagen, and other cities of Denmark, as well as Stralsund, Rostock, and other old cities of the Hansa, at once transformed their former municipal system, or gave to it a democratic cast, and joined hands with Lübeck in behalf of Christian II., whose measures, when he was on the throne, had looked to an increase of the power of the burgher class. The confederate cities established their alliance with England, and gained to their side a German prince, Duke Albert of Mecklenburg. This combination had to be overcome by Christian III., before he could reign over Denmark. His energetic efforts were successful; and with the defeat of Lübeck, the democratic or revolutionary movement, the radical element, which threatened to identify itself with the Reformation, was subdued. Sweden contributed its help to the attainment of this result. Wullenweber himself was brought to the scaffold. The principle of Luther and his associates, that the cause of religion must be kept separate from schemes of political or social revolution, was practically vindicated. In Münster, this principle had to be maintained against a socialist movement in which the clergy were the leaders. In Lübeck, it was political and commercial ambition that sought to identify with its own aspirations the Protestant reform. Christian III. was a Protestant; his triumph, and that of his allies, did not weaken the Protestant interest, although it subverted a new political fabric which had been set up in connection with it.

The reception of Protestantism in Norway was a consequence of the ecclesiastical revolution in Denmark. Christian III. was at first opposed in that country; but, in 1537, the Archbishop of Drontheim fled, with the treasures of his Cathedral, to the Netherlands, and Norway was reduced to the rank of a province of Denmark. In Iceland, Protestantism gained a lodgment through similar agencies, although the Bishop of Skalholt, who had been a student at Wittenberg, was an active and influential teacher of the new doctrine.

As early as 1519, two students who had sat at the feet of Luther in Wittenberg, Olaf and Lawrence Petersen, began to preach the evangelical doctrine in Sweden. The Reformation prevailed, however, through the political revolution which raised Gustavus Vasa to the throne. Christian II. of Denmark was supported in his endeavors to conquer Sweden, by papal edicts, and by the coöperation of the archbishop, Gustavus Trolle. The Swedish prelates were favorable to the Danish interest. Gustavus Vasa, a nobleman who was related to the family of Sturé, which had furnished several administrators or regents to Sweden prior to its conquest by Christian II., undertook to liberate his country from the Danish yoke, and succeeded in his patriotic enterprise. He was favorable to the Lutheran doctrine, and was the more inclined to secure for it the ascendency, as he coveted for his impoverished treasury the vast wealth which had been accumulated by the ecclesiastics. He appointed Lawrence Andersen, a convert to Lutheranism, his chancellor; Olaf Petersen he made a preacher in Stockholm, and Lawrence Petersen a theological professor at Upsala. Plots of the bishops in behalf of Christian II. naturally stimulated the predilection of Gustavus for the Protestant system. A public disputation was held in 1524, by the appointment of the king, at Upsala, in which Olaf Petersen maintained the Lutheran opinions. The pecuniary burdens which Gustavus laid upon the clergy excited disaffection among them. Finally, at the Diet of Westeras, in 1527, the controversy was brought to a crisis. Gustavus threatened to abdicate his throne if his demands were not complied with. The result was that liberty was granted "for the preachers to proclaim the pure Word of God," a Protestant definition being coupled with this phrase; and the property of the Church, with the authority to regulate ecclesiastical affairs, was delivered into the hand of the King. The churches which embraced the Protestant faith preserved their revenues. The ecclesiastical property fell for the most part to the possession of the nobles. The common people, not instructed in the new doctrine, were generally attached to the old religious system. Gustavus proposed to introduce changes gradually, and to provide for the instruction of the peasantry. He had to put down a dangerous insurrection which was excited in part by priests who were hostile to the religious innovations. By degrees the Swedish nation

acquired a firm attachment to the Protestant doctrine and worship. Gustavus was succeeded by Eric XIV., whose partiality to Calvinism made no impression on his subjects. Then followed John III. (1568–1592), who married a Catholic princess of Poland, and who made a prolonged, and what at times seemed likely to prove a successful effort, with the aid of astute Jesuits, to introduce a moderate type of Catholicism, and to reconcile the nation to its adoption. Popular feeling was against him; and after his death the liturgy which he had established and obstinately maintained, was abolished by a Council at Upsala in 1593, and the Augsburg Confession accepted as the creed of the national Church. Sigismund III. of Poland, on account of his Catholicism, was prevented from reigning; and the crown of Sweden was given to Gustavus Vasa's youngest son, Charles IX., who became king in 1604. A Calvinist in his inclination, he fell in with the general preference for Lutheranism.

The destruction of Huss by the Council of Constance in 1415, followed in the next year by the execution of Jerome of Prague, sent a thrill of indignation through the greater portion of the Bohemian people.[1] The Bohemians were converted from heathenism by two Greek monks, Methodius and Cyril; but the power of the Germans, coupled with the influence of the Roman See, secured their adhesion to the Latin Church. In the Middle Ages, however, a struggle took place between the vernacular and the Latin ritual. An application for leave to use the former was denied in a peremptory manner by Gregory VII. Underlying the movement of which Huss was the principal author, was a national and a religious feeling. The favorers of the Hussite reform were of the Slavic population; its opponents were the Germans. The contest of the two parties in the University of Prague led to an academical revolution, a change in the constitution of the University, which gave the preponderance of power in the conduct of its affairs to the natives. Hence, the German students left in a body; and out of this great exodus arose the University of Leipsic. The effect of this academical quarrel was to establish the ascendency of Huss and his follow-

[1] For works relating to Bohemian ecclesiastical history, see supra, p. 50; also Lenfant, *Hist. de la Guerre d. Hussites et du Concile de Basle;* Pesheck, *Geschichte d. Gegenreformat. in Böhmen* (1850).

ers. While the Council of Constance was in session, Jacobellus, priest of the Church of St. Michael at Prague, began to administer the cup to the laity; and the practice obtained the sanction of Huss himself. The cup had been originally withdrawn from laymen, not with the design to confer a new distinction upon the priestly order, but simply from reverence for the sacramental wine, which was often spilled in the distribution of it through an assembly.[1] The custom, once established, became a fixed rule in the Church, and contributed to enhance still further the dignity of the sacerdotal class. Thomas Aquinas aided in confirming the innovation by inculcating the doctrine of concomitance, the doctrine that the whole Christ is in each of the elements, and is received, therefore, by him who partakes of the bread alone. The Utraquists of Bohemia claimed the cup. They went beyond the position of Huss, and asserted that the reception of both elements is essential to the validity of the sacrament. Henceforward the demand for the chalice became the most distinguishing badge of the Hussites, the subject of a long and terrible contest. The Council at Constance pronounced the Utraquist opponents of the Church doctrine heretics.

Fifty-four Bohemian and Moravian nobles sent from Prague a letter to the Council in which they repelled the accusations of heresy which had been made against their countrymen, and denounced in the strongest language the cruel treatment of Huss. This was before the burning of Jerome, an event that raised the storm of indignation in Bohemia to a greater height. The Prague University declared for the Utraquists, and their doctrine speedily gained the assent of the major part of the nation.

The Council, and Martin V., resolved upon forcible measures for the repression of the Bohemian errorists. Bohemia was a constituent part of the German Empire, and the execution of these measures fell to the lot of Sigismund, its head, who was an object of special hatred in Bohemia on account of his agency in the death of Huss. There soon arose in Bohemia a powerful party which went far beyond the Utraquists in their doctrinal innovations, and in hostility to the Roman Church. The Taborites, as they were styled, gathered in vast multitudes to hear

[1] Gieseler, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 542.

preaching, and to cement their union with one another.[1] Their creed, which took on new phases from time to time, embraced the leading points of what, a century later, was included in Protestantism; although their tenets were not deduced from simple and fundamental principles, nor bound together in a logically coherent system. Unlike the ordinary Utraquists, they rejected transubstantiation. They also appealed to the Bible, as alone authoritative, and refused to submit to the decisions of the popes, to the councils, or to the fathers. For a while, chiliastic and apocalyptic theories prevailed among them. Discordant political tendencies separated the Utraquists from the Taborites — the latter cherishing democratic ideas respecting government and society. The opposition which they experienced converted their enthusiasm into fanaticism; and, moved by a furious iconoclastic spirit, they assaulted churches and convents, and destroyed the treasures which had been gathered by the priesthood, and the "implements of idolatry." In Ziska, the most noted of their leaders, they had a general of fierce and stubborn bravery; and under his guidance the force of the Hussites became well-nigh irresistible.

In 1421 the moderate Utraquists, or Calixtines, embodied their belief in four articles, the Articles of Prague, which became a memorable document in the history of the Hussite controversies.[2] They required that the Word of God should be preached freely and without hindrance, by Christian priests, throughout the kingdom of Bohemia; that the sacrament should be administered, in both forms, to all Christians, not excluded by mortal sin from the reception of it; that priests and monks should be divested of their control over worldly goods; that mortal sins, especially all public transgressions of God's law, whether by priests or laymen, should be subject to a regular and strict discipline; and that an end should be put to all slanderous accusations against the Bohemian people.

On the relations of the Utraquists to the Taborites, the moderate to the radical Hussites, the history of Bohemia for a century intimately depends. The two parties might unite in a crisis involving danger to both; but they were often at war with one another; and their common enemy knew how to turn to the best account their mutual differences. The most conspicuous feature

[1] Czerwenka, i. 130. [2] Czerwenka, i. 146; Gieseler, III. v. 5, § 151, n. 19.

that belonged to them, in common, was the demand that the cup should be administered to the laity.

Three crusades, undertaken by the authority, and at the command of the Church, filled Bohemia with the horrors of war; but they wholly failed to subdue the heretics who were united to resist them. Vast armies were beaten and driven out of the country. On the other hand, the Bohemians repaid the attacks made upon them, by devastating incursions into the neighboring German territory, ruled by their enemies.

Convinced, at last, of the futility of the effort to conquer the Hussites, their opponents consented to treat with them. By the advice of Cardinal Julian Cesarini, who had accompanied the last crusading army against them, and shared in its disastrous overthrow, the Œcumenical Council of Basel decided to enter into negotiations with them. Having first carefully obtained abundant guaranties for their personal safety, and solemn pledges that they should have a free and full hearing, the Utraquist delegates — representatives of both the leading parties, the Calixtines and Taborites — presented themselves at Basel. At their head was Rokyçana, who belonged to the moderate party, but was held in universal esteem for his talents, learning, and moral excellence. The Hussite theologians used their freedom to the full extent. They harangued the Council for days in defense of the proscribed doctrines, in vindication of the memory of Huss, and on the ecclesiastical abuses to which they had endeavored to apply a remedy. The difference between the two Bohemian parties was brought out in the speeches of their respective representatives, and was skillfully used by Cesarini and the Council, in order to widen the separation between them. After long negotiations, and the sending of an embassy from the Council to Bohemia, the Hussites obtained certain concessions which were set forth in a document termed the Compactata. The communion might be given in both kinds to all adults, who should desire it; but it must, at the same time, be taught that the whole Christ is received under each of the elements. The infliction of penalties on persons guilty of mortal sin, on which the Utraquists insisted, must be left with priests in the case of clerical persons, and with magistrates in the case of laymen. The Article in regard to the free preaching of the Word was qualified by confining the liberty to preach

to persons regularly called and authorized by bishops. As to the control of property, this was to be allowed to secular priests only, and by them to be exercised according to the prescribed rules. The Compactata was the charter, in defense of which the Utraquists waged many a hard contest; since it was a constant effort of the popes to annul the concessions which it contained, and to reduce even the most moderate of the Hussite sects to an exact conformity to the Roman ritual, and to the mandates of the Roman See. This agreement operated also to divide the Calixtines and Taborites into mutually hostile camps. An armed conflict ensued, in which the Taborites were thoroughly vanquished. Thenceforward the power remained in the hands of the Utraquists who were desirous of approaching as nearly to the doctrines and rites of the Catholic Church in other countries as their convictions would allow. It was far from being true that peace resulted from the downfall of the Taborites, and the conciliatory proceedings of the Calixtines. The history of Bohemia, through the fifteenth century, is a long record of bitter and bloody conflicts, having for their end the restoration of uniformity in religion. About the middle of the century, a new party, the Brethren in Unity, who inherited many of the doctrinal ideas of the Taborites, but with a more conservative tenet relative to the sacrament, and a more gentle and peaceful temper, separated entirely from the Church. They, in their turn, were the objects of persecution at the hands of the more orthodox Utraquists. Ultimately the Brethren were joined by some nobles, and acquired a greater degree of security. They were connected with certain Waldensian Christians, and, to some extent, influenced by them.

Thus Bohemia for several generations had really been engaged in a struggle to build up a national church in opposition to the dominating and unifying spirit of Rome. When Luther's doctrine became known, it was favorably received by the Brethren, and they desired to connect themselves with the Saxon reform. At first Luther was not satisfied with their opinions, especially on the sacrament; but, after conferences with them, he concluded that their faults were chiefly in expression and were owing to a want of theological culture. After the example of the Lutherans at Augsburg, the Evangelical Brethren, in 1535, presented to King Ferdinand their Confession. The

Calixtines were divided on the question of pushing forward the Hussite reform in the direction indicated by Luther. A majority of the estates was at first obtained in favor of declarations virtually Lutheran. But the more conservative Utraquists, who planted themselves on the Compactata, soon rallied and gained the upper hand. However, the Lutheran doctrine continued to spread and to multiply its adherents among the Calixtines as well as the Brethren. The two parties, on embracing Protestantism, differed from one another chiefly on points of discipline. When the Smalcaldic war broke out, the Utraquists refused to furnish troops to Ferdinand, in aid of the attempt of Charles V. to crush the Protestants, but joined the Elector of Saxony. The Bohemians shared in full measure the disasters which fell upon the Protestant party after their defeat at Mühlberg. Ferdinand inflicted upon them severe penalties. Toleration was now denied to all except the anti-Lutheran Hussites; and this drove many of the Brethren into Poland and Prussia. From the year 1552, the Jesuits who then came into the country endeavored to persecute all whose dissent from the Romish Church went beyond the standard of the Compactata. In 1575 the Evangelical Calixtines and Brethren united in presenting a confession of faith to Maximilian II. As the power of the Jesuits increased, there was no safety for the adherents of the Lutheran or the Swiss reform. In 1609, to such as received the confession of 1575, there was granted a letter patent — or "letter of majesty" — which placed them on a footing of legal equality with the Catholics. Persecution by the Catholics went on until, in 1627, it was required of all either to become Catholic, or quit the country.

When the German Reformation began, Poland was rising to that position which rendered it, a generation later, the most powerful kingdom in Eastern Europe. The Slavonic population of Poland had never manifested any peculiar devotion to the Roman See. Conflicts between nobles and bishops, in which carnal weapons on one side were often opposed to the excommunication and the interdict on the other, and contests between princes and the popes on questions of prerogative, had been abundant in Polish history for several centuries.[1] At the

[1] Dalton, in Hauck, *Realencyklopädie*, xv. 514 seq.; Leathes, in *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 634 seq.

Council of Constance, Poles were active in the party of reform. Well-founded disaffection at the immoral character of the clergy had widely prevailed. Hence the anti-sacerdotal sects, as the Waldenses and the Beghards, won many followers, and were not exterminated by the Inquisition, by which, about the middle of the fourteenth century, their open manifestation was suppressed. Far more influential were the Hussites, who did much to prepare the ground for Protestantism. Bohemian Brethren, driven from their own land, naturally took refuge in Poland. These circumstances, and other agencies, such as the residence of Polish students at Wittenberg and the employment of Lutheran teachers and preachers in the families of nobles, opened the door for the ingress of the Protestant doctrine. It early gained disciples, especially in the German cities of Polish Prussia. In Dantzig, the principal city of this province, it made such progress that in 1524 five churches were given up to its adherents.[1] But here a turbulent party arose who, not satisfied with toleration, insisted upon driving out the Catholic worship, and succeeded by violent measures in displacing the existing magistrates, and in supplying their places with officers from their own number. The interference of the King, Sigismund I., was invoked, who restored the old order of things. The progress of the Lutheran cause, however, was not stopped, and Dantzig in the next reign became predominantly Protestant. The council and the burghers of Elbing accepted the Reformation in 1523. Thorn also became Protestant. The advance of the Reformation in the neighboring communities made it impossible to exclude it from Poland, where numerous burghers and powerful nobles regarded it with favor. By the treaty of Thorn in 1466, the old Teutonic Order or crusading knights, which had long governed Prussia, surrendered West Prussia and Ermeland to Poland and retained East Prussia as a fief of the Polish crown. At the request of Albert of Brandenburg, the Grand Master, two preachers were sent by Luther to Königsberg, in 1523. The Reformation swiftly spread; and when Albert, after having been defeated by Poland, secularized his duchy, in 1525, the prevalence of the

[1] Krasinski, *Religious History of the Slavonic Nations*, p. 126; *History of the Reformation in Poland*, i. 112 seq.; *Die Schicksale d. Polnischen Dissidenten* (Hamburg, 1768), i. 423.

Protestant doctrine was secured. In 1544 he founded the University of Königsberg for the education of preachers and the extension of the new faith. In Livonia, which, after 1521, was independent of the Teutonic Order, the Reformation likewise found a willing acceptance. As early as 1524 Luther addressed a printed letter to the professors of the evangelical doctrine in Riga, Revel, and Dorpat. Cities in the various parts of Poland and families of distinction embraced the new faith. In 1548 a multitude of Bohemian Brethren, exiles from their country, came in to strengthen the Protestant interest. In this year Sigismund I. died, and was succeeded by his son, Sigismund II., or Sigismund Augustus, who was friendly to the evangelical doctrine. Calvin dedicated to him his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and subsequently corresponded with him. In the Diet of 1552, strong indignation was manifested against the clergy on account of the proceedings of an ecclesiastical tribunal against Stadnicki, an eminent nobleman. The clergy were forbidden to inflict any temporal punishment on those whom they might pronounce heterodox.[1] At a Diet at Piotrkow in 1555, a national council for the settlement of religious differences was demanded, and was prevented from assembling only by the strenuous exertions of the Pope. Religious freedom was granted by the king to the cities of Dantzig, Thorn, and Elbing: and also to Livonia in the treaty of 1561, by which it was annexed to Poland. Dissension among Protestants themselves was the chief hindrance in the way of the complete diffusion of the Protestant faith, which at this time had penetrated all ranks of society. The Calvinists were numerous; they organized themselves according to the Presbyterian form, and a union between them and the Brethren, in respect to doctrine, was cemented at a synod in 1555. Opposed to these were the Lutherans, who were mostly Germans, and who took little pains to propagate their system through the instrumentality of any other language than their own. The Unitarians formed a third party, which found a leader in the erudite Italian, Faustus Socinus, and became strong, in particular among the higher classes. The intestine divisions among the Protestants afforded in various ways a great advantage to

[1] Krasinski, *Relig. Hist. of the Slavonic Nations*, pp. 132, 133; Regenvolscius, *Hist. Eccles. Slavonicarum* (1654), p. 209.

their antagonists. An able, accomplished, and indefatigable defender of Catholicism was found in Hosius, Bishop of Culm, and, after 1551, of Ermeland. On the Protestant side, conspicuous for his efforts in behalf of union, as well as for his general character and diversified labors, was John à Lasco. Born of a wealthy and aristocratic family in Poland, he was destined for the priesthood, and after completing his studies in his native country, he resorted to foreign universities, especially Louvain and Basel. At Basel he was intimate with Erasmus, and for a time an inmate of his house. For eleven years, from the year 1526, he labored to establish in Poland a reformation after the Erasmian type. Finding his exertions fruitless, he left his country, took a more decided position on the Protestant side, and for a number of years superintended the organization of the Protestant Church in East Friesland. After the Smalcaldic war and the passage of the Interim, he went to England, where he was brought into a close relation with Cranmer, and took charge of the church of foreign residents, first in London and then, from 1553 to 1556, in Frankfort. After the Polish Diet in 1566 had granted a free exercise of the Protestant religion in the houses of individual noblemen, Lasco was called back to his country by King Sigismund. Here he labored to promote unity between the Calvinists and Lutherans, and for the spread of the Protestant faith. He died in 1560. Ten years after, the Lutherans, influenced by counsel from Wittenberg, where the school of Melancthon then had sway, joined with the Swiss and the Brethren, at the Synod of Sendomir, in the adoption of a common creed. This Confession is consonant with the Calvinistic view of the sacrament, but it carefully avoids language that might give offense to Lutherans; and it includes an explicit sanction of the Saxon Confession, which had been prepared to be sent to the Council of Trent.[1] After the death of Sigismund in 1572, the crown became elective, and the sovereigns were obliged to assent to the "Pax Dissidentium," which guaranteed equality of rights to all churches in the kingdom. Under the term "Dissidents" were included the Catholics as well as the other religious bodies. The Duke of Anjou, afterwards Henry III. of France, on being elected

[1] The *Consensus Poloniæ* or *Sendomirensis* is in Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 553. Krasinski, *Hist. of the Ref. in Poland*, I. c. ix.

King of Poland, in 1573, found it impossible to escape from taking solemn oaths to protect the Protestant religion against persecution and aggression. But the royal power was so much weakened that, although the monarchs might effect much by the bestowal of honors and offices, the fate of Protestantism depended mainly on the disposition of the nobles. To detach these from the Protestant side and to gain them over to the Catholic Church, through institutions of education and by other influences, formed one prime object of the Jesuits; to whom, in connection with the fatal divisions and quarrels of Protestants, the Catholic reaction was to be indebted for its great success in Poland.

Numerous Germans were settled in Hungary, by whom the doctrines and the writings of Luther were brought into that country. Bohemian Brethren, and Waldenses yet more, contributed to the favorable reception of Protestantism by the people among whom they dwelt. Hungarian students not only resorted to the universities of Poland, but went to Wittenberg also, and returned to disseminate the principles which they had learned from Luther and Melancthon. It was in vain that the new faith was forbidden. A savage law against Lutherans, which was passed at the Diet of Ofen, in 1523, did not stop the progress of the Protestant movement. It emanated from the people, and silently spread with great rapidity. In 1523 the Protestants were the prevailing party in Hermannstadt, and two years after, the five royal free cities in Upper Hungary adopted the Reformation.[1] The new views were embraced also by powerful nobles. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, princes of the Slavonic House of Jagellon reigned in the three kingdoms of Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary. But they found it for their interest to connect themselves, by matrimonial alliances, with the ruling family in Austria.[2] Louis II., in 1526, attempted to stem the great invasion of the Turks, under Soliman, with an insufficient force, and perished after his great defeat at Mohacs. Ferdinand of Austria claimed the thrones of Bohemia and Hungary, which the death of Louis left vacant. By prudent management, he succeeded in pro-

[1] Gieseler, IV. i. 2, § 16.
[2] Ranke, *Deutsch. Geschichte,* ii. 286 seq.

curing his election as King of Bohemia, against his ambitious competitor, the Duke of Bavaria. In Hungary he entered into war with a rival aspirant to the crown, one of the great magnates, John of Zápolya, voivode of Transylvania. Both Ferdinand and Zápolya found it expedient to denounce the Protestants, in order to secure the support of the bishops. But neither found it possible, in the circumstances in which they were placed, to engage in persecution. During this domestic conflict, the Reformation advanced in the portions of Hungary not occupied by the Turks. By the peace of 1538 Ferdinand gained the throne. John was to retain Transylvania and a part of Upper Hungary during his life. After his death, his Queen, Isabella, clung to his possessions, and this was the occasion of a continuance of war. The whole Saxon population of Transylvania adopted the Augsburg Confession; the Synod of Erdöd, in Hungary, issued a like declaration. Even the widow of Louis favored the Lutheran doctrine. Queen Isabella, in 1557, granted to the adherents of the Augsburg Confession equal political rights with the Catholics. Hungary, like Poland, was a severe sufferer through the strife of Protestants among themselves. The Swiss doctrine of the Eucharist found favor, especially among the native Hungarians. It derived increased popularity after the adoption of it by Matthew Dévay, who was the most eminent of the Protestant leaders.[1] After studying at Cracow, he resided for a time at Wittenberg, in the family of Luther; and, after his return to his country, became a very successful preacher of the Lutheran doctrines. He was more than once imprisoned, but did not cease, by preaching and by his publications, to promote the Protestant cause. In 1533 he published a Magyar translation of the Epistles of St. Paul, and three years afterwards a version of the Gospels. Dévay had been intimate with Melancthon, who preached in Latin to him and to other students who did not understand German; and he was well acquainted with Grynæus and other Swiss Reformers. About the year 1540 Dévay began to promulgate the Calvinistic view of the sacrament, to the amazement and disgust of Luther, who expressed his surprise in letters to Hungarians. In 1557,

[1] Hauck, *Realencycl.*, iv. 595 seq. Lampe, *Hist. Eccl. Ref. in Hungaria et Transylvania* (1728), p. 72.

or 1558, a Calvinistic creed was adopted by a Synod at Czenger.[1] The Calvinistic doctrine ultimately prevailed and established itself among the Magyar Protestants. In Transylvania, the Unitarians were numerous, and they were granted toleration in 1571; so that four legalized forms of religion existed there. Notwithstanding the unhappy contest of Lutherans and Calvinists, Protestantism continued to gain ground in Hungary, through the reigns of Ferdinand I. and Maximilian II., and for a long time under Rudolph II. Only three magnates remained in the old Church. But Hungary was to furnish a field on which the Catholic Reaction, under the management of the Jesuits, would exert its power with marked success.[2]

[1] *Confessio Czengerina*, in Niemeyer, p. 542. See, also, Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, i. 589 seq. In 1556 all of the Hungarian Calvinistic churches submitted to the *Confessio Helvetica*.

[2] At an early date, there were numerous followers of Luther in the Netherlands; but it will be more convenient to narrate the progress of Protestantism in other countries, after describing the rise of Calvinism.

CHAPTER VII

JOHN CALVIN AND THE GENEVAN REFORMATION

The Reformation was firmly established in Germany before it had taken root or had found an acknowledged leader among the Romanic nations. Such a leader at length appeared in the person of John Calvin, whose influence was destined to extend much beyond the bounds of the Latin nations and whose name was to go down to posterity in frequent association with that of Luther.[1] Calvin was born at Noyon, in Picardy, on the 10th of July, 1509. He was only eight years old when Luther posted his theses. He belongs to the second generation of reformers, and this circumstance is important as affecting both his own personal history and the character of his work. When he arrived at manhood, the open war upon the old Church had already been waged for a score of years. The family of Calvin had been of humble rank, but it was advanced by his father, Gerard Cauvin, who held various offices, including that of notary in the ecclesiastical court at Noyon, and secretary to the bishopric. The physical constitution of Calvin was not strong, but his uncommon intellectual power was early manifest. From his mother he received a strict religious training. Attracting the regard of the noble family of Mommor, residing at Noyon, he was taken under their patronage and instructed with their children. He had no experience of the rough conflict with

[1] The *Life of Calvin*, by Theodore Beza, is the work of a contemporary and friend: *Das Leben Johann Calvins*, von Paul Henry (Hamburg, 1835–44, 3 vols.), a thorough, but diffusely written biography: *Johann Calvin, seine Kirche u. sein Staat in Genf*, von F. W. Kampschulte, 2 vols. (Leipsic, 1869, 1899). Kampschulte is a Roman Catholic, thorough in his researches and dispassionate, but not friendly to Calvin. Henry and Kampschulte may be profitably read together. *Johannes Calvin, Leben u. ausgewählte Schriften*, von Dr. L. E. Stähelin (Elberfeld, 1863), 2 vols. This is the best of the German lives of the reformer. A valuable, impartial *Life of Calvin* is that of Dyer (London, 1850). Very attractive in its exterior and valuable in its details is the French work of E. Doumergue, *Jean Calvin, les hommes, et les choses de son temps*, 5 vols., *with numerous illustrations*. Herminjard, *Correspondence des réformateurs dans les pays de langue française*, 1866 — vols., is a rich collection of historical sources. The best collection of Calvin's Works is in the *Corpus Reformatorum*, Braunschweig, 1863–1900.

penury which many of the German and Swiss reformers were obliged in their youth to undergo. When only twelve years old, he was made the recipient of the income of a chaplaincy, which enabled him to prosecute his studies in Paris. To this stipend, a few years afterwards, the income of another benefice was added. At the outset his father intended that he should be a priest. When transferred to Paris, he was first in the Collége de la Marche, where he was taught Latin by a cultivated Humanist, Maturin Cordier, better known under the name of Corderius, for whom he cherished a lifelong attachment, and who became a devoted friend, and coöperated with him in fostering his plans for Christian Education in Switzerland and France, and whom he succeeded in placing in charge of his school at Geneva. He also studied in the Collége Montaigu, where he was trained in scholastic logic under a learned Spaniard, who afterwards, in the same school, guided the studies of Ignatius Loyola.[1] There Calvin surpassed his companions in assiduity and aptitude to learn. He was noted for his quick perception and skill in dialectics, but he spent much of the time by himself, and from his serious, and, perhaps, severe turn of mind, was nicknamed "The Accusative Case."[2] Beza says that this designation is reported to have been given Calvin by his schoolmates, on account of his being as a scholar exceedingly [in mirum modum] religious and a strict censor of all their faults. He had reached his eighteenth year, had received the tonsure, and even preached occasionally, but had not taken orders, when his father, from worldly motives, changed his plan and concluded to qualify his son for the profession of a jurist.[3] He accordingly prosecuted his legal studies under celebrated teachers at Orleans and Bourges, then the most famous law schools in France. As a student of law he attained the highest proficiency and distinction. He undermined his health by studying late into the night, in order to arrange and digest the contents of the lectures which he had heard during the day.[4] Early in the morning he would awake to repeat to himself what

[1] Kampschulte, i. 223. [2] Guizot, *St. Louis and Calvin*, p. 155.

[3] Calvin says of his father: "Quum videret legum scientiam passim augere suos cultores opibus, spes illa repente eum impulit ad mutandum consilium." — *Preface to the Psalms.* The father's motive appears to have been the prospect of wealth in the legal professions.

[4] Beza, *Vita Johannis Calvini*, ii. "Somni pœne nullius," says Beza in his closing remarks upon Calvin, xxxi.

he had thus reduced to order. He never required but a few hours for sleep, and, as was also the case with Melancthon, his intense mental activity frequently kept him awake through the night. Such was his progress, and so highly was he esteemed by his instructors that often when they were temporarily absent he took their place. At the same time he indulged his taste for literature, and learned Greek from the German professor of that language, Melchior Wolmar, with whom he stood in a friendly relation. The amount of Wolmar's religious influence on him was less than it is sometimes assumed to have been.[1] Before this time, at the urgent request of a Protestant relative, Peter Olivetan, afterwards the first Protestant translator of the Bible into French, he had directed his attention to the study of the Scriptures. In 1531, having completed his law studies at Bourges, he stayed for several weeks at his father's house. In the summer he returned to Paris, where he kept up his Humanistic studies. And we have little knowledge of him up to 1532, the date of his first publication, an annotated edition of Seneca's treatise on "Clemency," dated in April. It has been erroneously supposed that he hoped by this work to move Francis I. to adopt a milder policy towards the persecuted Protestants. No such design appears in the book.[2] His interest in literary studies was not chilled, and he aimed to bring himself into notice as a scholar and author. His notions of reform certainly did not exclude sympathy with the writings of Reuchlin and Erasmus. He writes to his friends to aid in circulating his book and in calling attention to it, a part of his motive being, however, to reimburse himself for the cost of the publication. His notes on Seneca show his wide acquaintance with the classics, his ethical discernment, and his interest in theological questions. But there is no profession on the side of the Reformation.

[1] See Hauck, *Realencycl. d. Theol. u. Kirche*, iii. p. 656.

[2] That the commentary on Seneca was designed to affect the French king in this way, and was composed, therefore, after Calvin's conversion, is assumed by many, among whom are Henry, i. 50, and Herzog in the art. "Calvin" in the *Realencycl. d. Theol.*, edited by himself; also by Guizot, *St. Louis and Calvin*, p. 162. For evidence to the contrary, see Stähelin, i. 14. The dedication (to the Abbot of St. Eloy) is dated April 4, 1532. Stähelin gives 1533 as the date of his conversion. Calvin says (*Preface to the Psalms*) that in less than a year after his conversion the Protestants were looking to him for instruction. The supposition that this religious change occurred shortly after the publication of Seneca's treatise best accords with Beza's statement, *Vita Calvini*, ii. See *infra*, p. 170.

Respecting the conversion of Calvin, there are questions relative to its mode or powers, and the chronology, which are still controverted. This is true especially as to what he himself terms his "sudden" conversion and the open espousal of Protestantism. The documents of most interest on these topics are his Letter to Sadolet and his Preface to the Psalms. In the Preface to his Commentary on the Psalms, he writes that when he was too devoted to the superstitions of Popery to be easily extracted, "God, by a sudden conversion brought his mind to a teachable frame." He writes: "After my heart had long been prepared for the most earnest self-examination, on a sudden the full knowledge of the truth, like a bright light, disclosed to me the abyss of errors in which I was weltering, the sin and shame with which I was defiled. A horror seized on my soul when I became conscious of my wretchedness and of the more terrible misery that was before me. And what was left, O Lord, for me, miserable and abject, but, with tears and cries of supplication, to abjure the old life which Thou condemned, and to flee into Thy path?" He describes himself as having striven in vain to attain inward peace by the methods set forth in the teaching of the Church. But the more he had directed his eye inward or upward to God, the more did his conscience torment him. "Only one haven of salvation is there for our souls," he says, "and that is the compassion of God, which is offered to us in Christ:" "We are saved by grace not by our merits, not by our works. Since we embrace Christ by faith, and, as it were, enter into his fellowship, we call this, in the language of Scripture, 'justification by faith.'" We know less of Calvin's inward experience than we know of Luther's, and even its essential identity with that of Luther is by some doubted. Calvin had hesitated about becoming a Protestant, out of reverence for the Church. But he so modified his conception of the Church as to perceive that the change did not involve a renunciation of it.[1] Membership in the true Church was consistent with renouncing the rule of the Roman Catholic prelacy; for the Church, in its essence invisible, exists in a true form wherever the Gospel is faithfully preached and the sacraments administered conformably to the directions of Christ. Calvin was naturally reserved and even bashful; he aspired after nothing

[1] *Epist. ad Sadolet. Opera* (ed. Reuss al.), vol. v. 385 seq.

higher, either after or before his conversion, than the opportunity to pursue his studies in retirement. He had an instinctive repugnance to publicity and conflict. His former studies, to be sure, had now a secondary place; his whole soul was absorbed in the examination of the Bible and in the investigation of religious truth.[1] But still he craved seclusion and quiet. He found, however, that, notwithstanding his youth, in the company of the persecuted Protestants at Paris he was quickly regarded as a leader, and his counsel was sought by all who had need of religious instruction.

Notice may here be given to the chronological problem pertaining to his conversion. The tradition was early accepted and has been long adopted that Calvin wrote for his friend, Nicholas Cop, who had been made Rector of the University of Paris, the opening Address, in which there were introduced the ideas of the Reformation, and that the doctrines thus declared awakened a hostile excitement, which not only obliged Cop to fly to escape arrest, which is admitted, but Calvin also. The learned critic, R. Stähelin, of late has brought together *data* that convince him that the supposition of Calvin's authorship of Cop's Address is a mistake. With this opinion is connected further the persuasion that at this time of the Paris agitation and Cop's Address, Calvin did not, and had not before, avowed himself a convert to the Protestant Creed and resumed his adhesion to the Church and Creed of Rome. Stähelin seeks to show that this living experience and profession of the new faith were at a later date, when at Noyon he resigned his benefices, and was there arrested and for a good while confined in prison by the adherents of the old Church. The position of Stähelin, as to the dates, is withstood by A. Lang, Domprediger in Halle,[2] who brings together important evidence of the authorship by Calvin of Cop's Address, of Calvin's co-working in Paris with the Protestant converts, and of his spiritual consecration to God between August 23, 1533, and the end of October, of that year, his giving of himself thenceforward to the service of the Gospel. His resignation and imprisonment at Noyon was early in May, 1534.

[1] Bonnet, *Letters of Calvin*, i. 7, 8.

[2] *Die Bekehrung Johannes Calvins*, von A. Lang, Leipsic, 1897. With the proofs offered by Lang is an interesting statement of the principal contents, ch. iv. p. 43 seq.

Surprise has been felt at the prominence often given by Calvin to the impression made on him, through the Scriptures, of the divine authority of the Bible and of the Law of God, in comparison with the less he has to say of the doctrine of the Saviour's work in behalf of the sinner, and of the one indispensable need of dependence on Christ as the ground of forgiveness. Lang finds in Cop's Address much on these last vital points of the Gospel, which corresponds, in part sentence by sentence, to portions of a sermon of Luther, preached in 1522 on the same festal day as the day of that Address, and which, taken up in the Church Postils, might have been made known in France through one of the Latin translations.[1] The connection of these extracts with what is said through Cop of the grace of God to the believer, with no merit on his part, who nevertheless receives with indubitable certainty the free pardon of sin and peace, Lang recognizes as an expression by Calvin of his own personal experience, and as one of the evidences of its identity with the mind of Luther, as regards the place of law and of the work of Christ in the practical reception of the Gospel. The copious reproduction in Cop of these excerpts is analogous to a like citation from pages of Erasmus, which Lang likewise ascribes to the pen of Calvin.

The extended researches of M. Doumergue embrace a careful discussion of the conversion of Calvin.[2] Doumergue gives high praise to Lang's very recent and remarkable "Study of the Conversion of Calvin," but does not concur with him in full. With Lang, he defends the thesis that Calvin's authorship is at the basis of Cop's Address. He does not concede that Calvin used the term "conversion" in exactly the sense in which we use it now. When the religious change in himself is referred to, the successive stages in this change, if not mentioned, are not meant to be disavowed. This is the case when the change is referred to as "sudden." It was brought to pass, realized, between August 23 and November 1, 1533.[3] "Calvin," Lang has said, "broke suddenly (not *gradually* but *suddenly*) with all that which had been for him up to that time the end or goal of his efforts, his ideal. In 1532 he contented himself with a completely superficial acquaintance with the Vulgate. To the end of 1533 the study of Scripture in the original tongues filled his

[1] Lang, p. 47 seq. [2] Tom. I. Livre troisième, p. 327 seq. [3] vi. p. 342.

heart." "Before 1532, and perhaps to the middle of 1533, the religious question is for him as if it did not exist." [1] Doumergue brings much evidence to show that the successive changes in Calvin's mind are not connected by him with particular designation of time. Doumergue [2] differs pointedly from Lefranc [3] who differentiates in a marked way the religious experience of Calvin from that of Luther. "The *definitive* of Calvin," says Lefranc, "was before everything of logic and of reflection, where sentiment counted for nothing (ne fut pour rien)."

Lang sums up in a few closing pages of his Essay the relation of Calvin's religious experience to that of Luther (pp. 53–57). In the recognition, says Lang, that we can do nothing of our own strength to attain the approval (Wohlgefallen) of God, that His grace, however, gives without any merit, to the believer, with an absolute assurance, the forgiveness of sin and peace of mind — therein for the author of the Cop Address are the essential contents of the Gospel: where else could Calvin have received this conviction save from his own experience? At the point in the Address where Luther is left, the speaker, affected as he was by the religious movement in Paris, was suddenly *getroffen* by the hand of God. He heard the will of the Law. His conscience was burdened, but the promise of the Gospel came to him; he laid hold of it in faith, in undoubting assurance that God forgives sin and without any merit justifies. His highest good becomes peace and conscience, peace with God. Not from the Church Postils only, but soon by plunging in other writings (in Latin) of Luther, he revered him for life as a father in Christ. His difference from Luther is in giving greater prominence to the declaration in Scripture of the pardoning grace of God. The peculiarity of Calvin is the more emphatic and conspicuous teaching of what is called the *Formal Principle of Protestantism* — the authority of the Bible.

Leaving Paris after Cop's Address, Calvin went from place to place. He first went to Angoulême, where he enjoyed the society of his friend Louis du Tillet and the use of a good library. He visited Béarn, and at the court of Margaret, the Queen of Navarre, sister of Francis I., he met the aged Lefèvre, the father

[1] Doumergue, p. 342.
[2] Tom. I. p. 350 N.
[3] *La Jeunesse de Calvin*, pp. 96, 97, 98.

of the Reformation in France. Then followed the visit to Noyon to resign his benefices. Returning to Paris after his imprisonment, he was again in peril. The intemperate zeal of the Protestants in posting placards against the mass stirred up the wrath of the court, and he was again obliged to fly. Not without a struggle and tears he bade farewell to his country.[1] He tarried again at Angoulême, in the house of du Tillet. At about this time (1534) tradition places the date of his first theological publication, the "Psychopannychia," a polemical book against the doctrine which was professed by Anabaptists that the soul sleeps between death and the resurrection. It may in its groundwork have been composed then, but it appears to be shown that it was first printed in 1542. At Strasburg he was warmly received by Bucer, and at Basel by Grynæus and Capio. At Basel he began to acquire the Hebrew language, and was able to gratify his strong inclination for retirement and study. It was here that he wrote his "Institutes." [2] The first edition, of 1536, was only the germ of the work, which grew in successive issues to its present size.[3] What moved him to the composition of it was the cruel persecution to which his brethren were subject in France. He wished to remove the impression that they were fanatical Anabaptists, seeking the overthrow of civil order, which their oppressors, in order to pacify the displeasure of German Lutherans, industriously propagated.[4] He was desirous of bringing Francis I. into sympathy with the new doctrine. For this last end the dedication to the king, which has been generally admired for its literary merit, and as a condensed and powerful vindication of the Protestant cause, was composed. This eloquent appeal to the justice of the king concludes thus: "But if your ears are so preoccupied with the whispers of the malevolent as to leave no opportunity for the accused to speak for themselves, and if those outrageous furies, with your connivance, continue to persecute with imprisonments, scourges,

[1] Henry, i. 156.

[2] The interesting literary question as to the language in which it first appeared, whether Latin or French, may, perhaps, be regarded as settled. It was first printed in Latin, and the author's name was attached to it. See the Prolegomena to the new edition of Calvin's writings, edited by Baum, Cunitz, and Reuss; and Stähelin, i. 61. Guizot, however, still holds that the first edition was in French. *St. Louis and Calvin*, p. 176. It appeared in 1536.

[3] This he says was his sole motive: "Neque in alium finem," etc. *Pref. to the Psalms.*

[4] So Stähelin, in Hauck, *Realencycl.*, etc., iii, p. 658.

tortures, confiscations, and flames, we shall indeed, like sheep destined to the slaughter, be reduced to the greatest extremities. Yet shall we in patience possess our souls, and wait for the mighty hand of the Lord, which undoubtedly will in time appear, and show itself armed for the deliverance of the poor from their affliction, and for the punishment of their despisers, who now exult in such perfect security. May the Lord, the King of Kings, establish your throne with righteousness, and your kingdom with equity." Although this famous manual was much amplified from time to time, until it appeared with the author's latest changes and additions in 1559, yet the doctrine of it underwent no alteration, and the identity of the work was always preserved.[1] We may notice in this place some of Calvin's characteristics as a writer and a man. His direct influence was predominantly and almost exclusively upon the higher classes of society. He and his system acted powerfully upon the people, but indirectly through the agency of others. He was a patrician in his temperament. By his early associations, and as an effect of his culture, he acquired a certain refinement and decided affinities for the class elevated by birth or education. This was one of his points of dissimilarity to Luther: he was not fitted, like the German reformer to come home to "the business and bosoms" of common men. He had not the popular eloquence of Luther, nor had he the genius that left its impress on the words and works of the Saxon reformer; but he was a more exact and finished scholar than Luther. The Latin style of Calvin has been universally praised for its classical purity. He was a terse writer hating diffuseness. He was master of a logical method, a great lover of neatness and order. In all his words there glows the fire of an intense conviction. The "Institutes" are in truth a continuous oration, in which the stream of discussion rolls onward with an impetuous current, yet always keeps within its defined channel. The work, in its whole tone, is removed as far as possible from the dry treatises of scholastic theology, with which it has often been classed. In forming an estimate of Calvin, as a thinker, the first thing to observe is that he was a Frenchman and a lawyer. His nature and his training con-

[1] A tabular view of the changes in the successive editions is presented in the latest edition of Calvin's writings, *Opera* (Reuss et al.), vol. i.

spired to make him eminently logical and systematic. That talent for organization which is ascribed to his countrymen as a national trait belonged to him in an eminent degree. It was manifested in the products of his intellect, not less than in his practical activity. He came forward at a moment when the ideas of the Reformation were widely diffused, but when no adequate reduction of them to a systematic form had been achieved. The dogmatic treatise of Melancthon, meritorious though it be, was of comparatively limited scope. The field was for the most part open; and when Calvin appeared upon it, he was at once recognized as fully competent for his task, and greeted by Melancthon himself as "the theologian." By the enemies of Protestantism his work was styled "the Koran of the heretics." Of the clearness, coherence, and symmetry of all its discussions, there is no need to speak. It is remarkable that the theological opinions of Calvin remained unchanged from the time of his conversion to his death.[1] This, it is well known, was far from being true of Luther, or of Melancthon, or even of Zwingli. One prime characteristic of his system is the steadfast, consistent adoption of the Bible as the sole standard of doctrine. He scouts the doctrine that the truth of the Bible rests on the authority of the Church. The Divine authority of the Bible can be proved by reason; assured conviction of the truth of the Gospel and a spiritual insight are imparted by the Holy Ghost. What cannot verify itself by the explicit authority of Scripture counts for nothing. That inbred reverence for the ancient Church and that influence of Christian antiquity, which are seen in Luther, were entirely foreign to Calvin. He holds the Fathers, especially Augustine, in esteem; but he makes no apologies for sharply contradicting them all, in case he deems them at variance with Holy Writ. For the Papacy, and for the tenets and rites which he considers the "impious inventions of men," without warrant from the Word of God, he feels an intense hatred, not unmingled with scorn. Yet, probably, none of the Reformers speak so often and with so much deference of the Church. But by the Church he means something

[1] Beza has noticed this fact — *Vita Calvini*, xxxi. Lecky (*History of Rationalism*, i. 373) says, speaking of the eucharistic controversy: "Calvin only arrived at his final views after a long series of oscillations." This is quite erroneous; there is no reason for thinking that Calvin ever had but one opinion on this subject after his conversion.

different from the sacerdotal organization of the Roman Catholic body. He holds to the Church invisible, composed of true believers; and to the Church visible, the criteria of which are the right administration of the sacraments, and the teaching of the Word. For the visible Church, as thus constituted, he feels the deepest reverence, and holds that out of it there is no salvation. The schismatic cuts himself off from Christ. For the Church, as established after the model of the New Testament, he demands a submission little short of that which the Roman Catholic pays to the authorized expounders of his faith.[1] But the striking, the peculiar, feature of Calvin's system, is the doctrine of Predestination. This doctrine, at the outset, indeed, was common to all of the Reformers. Predestination is asserted by Luther, in his book on the "Servitude of the Will," even in relation to wickedness, in terms more emphatic than the most extreme statements of Calvin. Melancthon, for a considerable period, wrote in the same strain. Zwingli, in his metaphysical theory, did not differ from his brother Reformers. They were united in reviving the Augustinian theology, in opposition to the Pelagian doctrine, which affected in a greater or less degree all the schools of Catholic theology. It is very important to understand the motives of the Reformers in this proceeding. Calvin was not a speculative philosopher who thought out a necessitarian theory and defended it for the reason that he considered it capable of being logically established. It is true that the keynote in his system was a profound sense of the exaltation of God. Nothing could be admitted that seemed to clash in the least with His universal control, or to cast a shade upon His omniscience and omnipotence. But the direct grounds or sources of his doctrine were practical. Predestination to him is the correlate of human dependence; the counterpart of the doctrine of grace; the antithesis to salvation by merit; the implied consequence of man's complete bondage to sin. In election, it is involved that man's salvation is not his own work, but, wholly, the work of the grace of God; and in election, also, there is laid a sure foundation for the believer's security under all the assaults of temptation. It is practical interests which Calvin is sedulous to guard; he clings

[1] See, for example, his *Acta Synodi Tridentinæ cum Antidoto* (1547), or Henry, i. 312.

to the doctrine for what he considers its religious value, and it is no more than justice to him to remember that he habitually styles the tenet, which proved to be so obnoxious, an unfathomable mystery, an abyss into which no mortal mind can descend. And, whether consistently or not, there is the most earnest assertion of the moral and responsible nature of man. Augustine had held that in the fall of Adam the entire race were involved in a common act and a common catastrophe. The will is not destroyed; it is still free to sin, but is utterly disabled as regards holiness. Out of the mass of mankind, all of whom are alike guilty, God chooses a part to be the recipients of his mercy, whom He purifies by an irresistible influence, but leaves the rest to suffer the penalty which they have justly brought upon themselves. In the "Institutes," Calvin does what Luther had done in his book against Erasmus; he makes the Fall itself, the primal transgression, the object of an efficient decree. In this particular he goes beyond Augustine, and apparently affords a sanction to the extreme, or supra-lapsarian type of theology, which afterwards found numerous defenders — which traces sin to the direct agency of God, and even founds the distinction of right and wrong ultimately on His omnipotent will.[1] But when Calvin was called upon to define his doctrine more carefully, as in the *Consensus Genevensis*, he confines himself to the assertion of a permissive decree — a volitive permission — in the case of the first sin. In other words, he does not overstep the Augustinian position. He explicitly avers that every decree of the Almighty springs from reasons which, though hidden from us, are good and sufficient; that is to say, he founds will upon right, and not right upon will.[2] He differs, however, both from Augustine and Luther, in affirming that none who are once converted fall from a state of grace, the number of believers being coextensive with the number of the elect. The main peculiarity of Calvin's treatment of this subject, as compared with the course pursued by the other Reformers, is the greater prominence which he gives to Predestination. It stands in the foreground; it is never left out of sight. Luther's practical handling of this dogma was quite different. Under his influ-

[1] *Inst.*, III. xxiii. 6 seq.

[2] *Opera* (Amst. ed.), tom. viii. 638, "Clare affirmo nihil decernere sine optima causa: quæ si hodie nobis incognita est, ultimo die patefiet."

ence it retreated more and more into the background, until not only in Melancthon's system, but also in the later Lutheran theology, unconditional Predestination disappeared altogether.

As a commentator, the ability of Calvin is very great. The first of his series of works in this department — his work on the Epistle to the Romans — was issued while he was at Strasburg, after his expulsion from Geneva. The preparation of his commentaries was always the most congenial of his occupations. If his readers, he once said, gathered as much profit from the perusal as he did from the composition of them, he should have no reason to regret the labor which they had cost. He was possessed of an exegetical tact which few have equaled. He has the true spirit of a scholar. He detests irrelevant talk upon a passage, but unfolds its meaning in concise and pointed terms. He is manly, never evades difficulties, but always grapples with them; and he is candid. He makes, on points of dogma, qualifications and occasional concessions which are generally left out of his polemical treatises, but which are indispensable to a correct appreciation of his opinions. If he created an epoch in doctrinal theology, it is equally true that he did much to found a new era, for which, however, Melancthon and others had paved the way, in the exegesis of the Scriptures. Luther seized on the main idea of a passage, but was less precise as a philological critic. The palm belongs to Luther, as a translator, to Calvin, as an interpreter of the Word.

Notwithstanding the radical principles of Calvin, it deserves to be remarked that as a practical Reformer, he was, in some marked particulars, not the extremist which he is commonly supposed to have been. He did not favor the iconoclastic measures of men like Knox. He was not even hostile to bishops as a *jure humano* arrangement.[1] He would not have cared to abolish the four Christian festivals, which the Genevan Church, without his agency, early discarded. In his epistles to Somerset, the Protector in the time of Edward VI., and to the English Reformers, he criticises freely the Anglican Church. Too much, he said, was conceded to weak brethren; to bear with the weak does not mean that "we are to humor blockheads who wish for this or that, without knowing why." He thought it a scandal, he wrote to Cranmer, that so many papal corrup-

[1] Henry, ii. 138, 139.

tions remain; for example, that "idle gluttons are supported to chant vespers in an unknown tongue." But he was indifferent respecting various customs and ceremonies, which a more rigid Puritanism made it a point of conscience to abjure.

There are marked personal traits of Calvin, which exhibit themselves in his letters and other writings, and which we shall find illustrated in the course of his life. Instead of the geniality, which is one of the native qualities of Luther, we find an acerbity, which is felt more easily than described, and which, more than anything else, has inspired multitudes with aversion to him. Beza, his disciple, friend, and biographer, states that in his boyhood he was the censor of the faults of his mates.[1] Through life, he had a tone, in reminding men of their real or supposed delinquencies, which provoked resentment. To those much older than himself, to men like Cranmer and Melancthon, he wrote in this unconsciously cutting style. There was much in the truthfulness, fidelity, and courage, which he manifests even in his reproofs, to command respect. Yet, there was a tart quality which, coupled with his unyielding tenacity of opinion, was adapted to provoke disesteem. We learn from Calvin himself, that Melancthon, mild as he was naturally, was so offended at the style of one of his admonitory epistles that he tore it in pieces. The wretched health of Calvin, with the enormous burdens of labor that rested upon him for years, had an unfavorable effect upon a temper naturally irritable. He was occasionally so carried away by gusts of passion that he lost all self-control.[2] He acknowledges this fault with the utmost frankness; he had tried in vain, he says, to tame "the wild beast of his anger;" and on his death-bed he asked pardon of the Senate of Geneva for outbursts of passion, while at the same time he thanked them for their forbearance. The later biographers of Calvin, even such as admire him most, have remarked that his piety was unduly tinged with the Old Testament spirit. It is significant that the great majority of the texts of his homilies and sermons, as far as they have been preserved, are from the ancient Scriptures. Homage to law is

[1] It was a current phrase at Geneva: "Besser mit Beza in der Hölle als mit Calvin im Himmel." Henry, i. 171.

[2] See his Letter to Farel (April, 1539), Henry, i. 256. See, also, p. 435 seq., ii. 432. "The mass of his occupations," Calvin says, "had confirmed him in an irritable habit." Henry, i. 465.

a part of his being. To bring thought, feeling, and will, to bring his own life, and the lives of others, to bring Church and State, into subjection to law, is his principal aim. He is overcome with awe at the inconceivable power and holiness of God. This thought is uppermost in his mind. Of his conversion, he writes: "God suddenly produced it; he suddenly subdued my heart to the obedience of His will." To obey the will of God was his supreme purpose in life, and in this purpose his soul was undivided; no mutinous feeling was suffered to interpose a momentary resistance. But the tender, filial temper often seems lost in the feeling of the subject toward his lawful Ruler. A sense of the exaltation of God not only takes away all fear of men, but seems to be attended with some loss of sensibility with regard to their lot. To promote the honor of God, and to secure that end at all hazards, is the chief object in view. Whatever, in his judgment, brings dishonor upon the Almighty, as, for example, attacks made upon the truth, moves his indignation, and he feels bound, in conscience, to confront such attacks with a pitiless hostility. He considers it an imperative duty, as he expressly declares, to hate the enemies of God. In reference to them, he says: "I would rather be crazed than not be angry." [1] Hence, though not consciously vindictive, and though really placable in various instances where he was personally wronged, he was on fire the moment that he conceived the honor of God to be assailed. How difficult it would be for such a man to discriminate between personal feeling and zeal for a cause with which he felt himself to be thoroughly identified, it is easy to understand. Calvin did not touch human life at so many points as did Luther; and having a less broad sympathy himself, he has attracted less sympathy from others. The poetic inspiration that gave birth to the stirring hymns of the German Reformer was not among his gifts. He wrote a poem in Latin hexameters, on the triumph of Christ, which was composed at Worms during the Conference there — in which he describes Eck, Cochlæus, and other Catholic combatants, as dragged after the chariot of the victorious Redeemer. A few hymns, mostly versions of Psalms, have lately been traced to his pen.[2] It has been noticed that although he spent the most

[1] Henry, i. 464.

[2] See *Calvini Opera* (Reuss et al.), vol. vi. One of these hymns, translated by Mrs. H. B. Smith, is in Schaff's collection of religious poetry, *Christ in Song* (1869).

of his life on the borders of the Lake of Geneva, he nowhere alludes to the beautiful scenery about him. Yet, there is something impressive, though it be a defect, in this exclusive absorption of his mind in things invisible. When we look at his extraordinary intellect, at his culture — which opponents, like Bossuet, have been forced to commend — at the invincible energy which made him endure with more than stoical fortitude infirmities of body under which most men would have sunk, and to perform, in the midst of them, an incredible amount of mental labor; when we see him, a scholar naturally fond of seclusion, physically timid, and recoiling from notoriety and strife, abjuring the career that was most to his taste, and plunging with a single-hearted, disinterested zeal, and an indomitable will, into a hard, protracted contest, and when we follow his steps, and see what things he effected, we cannot deny him the attributes of greatness. The Senate of Geneva, after his death, spoke of "the majesty" of his character.

Calvin published the first edition of the Institutes, without the knowledge of any one, at Basel, so averse was he to notoriety. Apart from the repute of this work, his fame as an acute, promising theologian was extending. Having visited Italy, and remained for a while at Ferrara, at the court of the accomplished Duchess, the daughter of Louis XII., and the protector of the Protestants, with whom he kept up a correspondence afterwards, he returned to Basel, and thence made a secret visit to France, and to his native place. On account of the obstruction of the route through Lorraine, by the army of Charles V., he set out to return by the way of Geneva. There he arrived late in July, 1536, with the design of tarrying but a single night; after which he expected to pursue his journey to Basel. Here occurred the event that shaped the future course of his life.

The war of Cappel, in which Zwingli had fallen, had left the preponderance in the Swiss Confederacy in the hands of the Catholics. They used their power to humiliate their adversaries in various ways, and to reëstablish the old religion in some districts from which it had been expelled or in which the people were divided. The leading cities of Zurich, Berne, and Basel, however, remained faithful to the Reformation. A mixture of political circumstances and religious influences at length created a new seat for Protestantism at Geneva.

Geneva, situated on the border of Lake Leman, was a fragment of the old Kingdom of Burgundy, and was governed for many centuries by the bishop, who was chosen by the canons of the Cathedral. The bishop, by an arrangement with the neighboring counts of Geneva, had committed to them his civil jurisdiction; but on acceding to office, he always swore to maintain the franchises and customs of the citizens. The counts held the castle on the Isle of the Rhone. Toward the end of the thirteenth century, this office of Vidame or Vice-regent was transferred from them to the dukes of Savoy. The city for the most part ruled itself after a republican form, and the Emperors Frederic Barbarossa, Charles IV., and Sigismund, as a means of protecting it against encroachments on the part of Savoy and of the counts of Geneva, recognized the place as a city of the Empire. Once a year the four syndics who practically managed the government were chosen by the assembly of citizens. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the ambitious projects of the Vidames led the Genevans to look for help and support to the Swiss cantons. Charles III., who became Duke of Savoy in 1504, entered into a struggle, for the subjugation of Geneva, which continued twenty years. Finding it impossible to secure his end by artful negotiation with the citizens, he, with the assistance of Pope Leo X., forced upon them, in 1513, John, the Bastard of Savoy, who became bishop under the stipulation that he would give the control of the city, as far as civil affairs were concerned, into the hands of the Duke. The citizens, under the lead of Bonivard, Berthelier, and other patriots, made a brave resistance. The Duke acquired the mastery, and Berthelier was put to death. The revolution which liberated the city from the tyranny of Savoy and restored its freedom was achieved by the aid of Berne and Freiburg. The Genevans were divided into two parties, the Confederates (Eidgenossen), who were for striking hands with the Swiss, and the Mamelukes, or adherents of the Duke. The former were successful. The office of Vidame was abolished, and civil and military power passed from the bishop into the hands of the people (1533).

The civil was followed by an ecclesiastical revolution. Berne became Protestant; Freiburg remained Catholic. From Berne a Protestant influence was exerted in Geneva. The young

people made use of their liberty to disregard the prescriptions of the Church in respect to abstinence from meat on fast days, and disputes arose between the citizens and the ecclesiastics. Some effort was made to correct the dissolute habits of the priests, of whom there were three hundred in Geneva, in order to take a potent weapon out of the hands of the reformers. But Protestantism, by the efforts of Farel and other preachers, gained ground, until at length, in 1535, with the aid of Berne, a second revolution took place, in which the bishop was expelled, and Protestantism was established. In connection with this change, the adjacent territory was conquered, and with it the castles which had served as strongholds of the Duke, and as convenient places of shelter for fugitives, and for the organization of attacks upon the city. Geneva was reformed, and at the same time gained its independence.[1]

The principal agent in planting the new doctrine in Geneva had been William Farel, born in 1489, of a noble family in Gap, in Dauphiné; a convert to Protestantism, driven out of France by persecution, and welcomed to Switzerland as one able to preach to the French population in their own language. Honest and fearless, but intemperate in language and conduct, he fulminated against the tenets and practices of Rome, in city and country, in the churches or by the wayside, wherever he could find an audience. Wherever he preached, his stentorian voice rose above the loudest tumult that was raised to drown it. On one occasion he seized the relics from the hand of a priest in a procession, and flung them into an adjacent river. He was frequently beaten and his life put in imminent peril. He was said to have denounced Erasmus at Basel as another Balaam, and Erasmus repaid the compliment by describing him, in a letter, as the most arrogant, abusive, and shameless man he had ever met with.[2] Yet Farel did not limit himself to denunciation. He understood well, and knew how to inculcate, eloquently, the distinctive doctrines of the Protestant faith. His earliest attempt in Geneva was in 1532, immediately after

[1] The revolutions in Geneva and the introduction of the Reformation are described by Ruchat, *Histoire de la Réformation de la Suisse*, nouvelle ed., 7 vols. Nyon, 1835–1838; also by Kampschulte, *Johann Calvin*, etc., vol. i.; and in great detail by Merle D'Aubigné, *History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin*. See, also, Mignet's Essay on Calvinism in Geneva (*Memoirs Hist.*, 3d ed., Paris, 1854).

[2] *Opera*, iii. 823. Kirchhofer, *Das Leben W. Farels*, c. iv.

the first revolution. He was then driven from the city, and owed his life to the bursting of a gun that was aimed at him. The second time he was more successful. The new doctrine was eagerly heard and won numerous disciples. At the political revolution, which expelled the bishop, the Protestant faith was adopted by the solemn act of the citizens. The general council, or the assembly of citizens, legalized the new order of divine service, which included the administration of the Supper thrice in the year; abolished all the festivals except Sunday, and prohibited worldly sports, such as dances and masquerades. The citizens took an oath to cast off the Romish doctrine and to live according to the rule of the Gospel. But signs of disaffection soon appeared. A large portion of the inhabitants of this prosperous, luxurious, and pleasure-loving city soon grew impatient of the new restraints which they had accepted in the moment of exhilaration over their newly gained political independence. They cried out openly against the preachers and demanded freedom.

There is no reason to doubt that the morals of Geneva were in a low state. The Savoyards had sought to secure the adherence of the young men by means of dances and convivial entertainments; and Berthelier endeavored to baffle this purpose by joining with them himself in their noisy banquets and licentious amusements. The priests and monks, according to trustworthy contemporary accounts, were exceptionally profligate.[1] The prostitutes, over whom there was placed a queen who was regularly sworn to the fulfillment of prescribed functions, were far from being confined to the quarter of the city which was specially assigned to them. Gambling houses and wine shops were scattered over the town. The various motives of opposition to the new system were sufficient to develop a powerful party that demanded the old customs and the former liberty. They clamored for deliverance from the yoke of the preachers.

Geneva was in this factious, confused state when Calvin arrived there, and took his lodgings at an inn, with the intention of remaining only for the night. In his Preface to the Commentary on the Psalms, which contains the most interesting passages of autobiography that we possess from his pen,

[1] Kampschulte, i. 90 seq.

he gives an account of his interview with Farel, to whom his arrival had been reported by his friend, Du Tillet. Farel besought him to remain and assist him in his work. Calvin declined, pleading his unwillingness to bind himself to any one place, and his desire to prosecute his studies. Seeing that his persuasions were fruitless, Farel told him that he might put forward his studies as a pretext, but that the curse of God would light on him if he refused to engage in His work. Calvin often refers to this declaration, uttered with the fervor of a prophet. He says that he was struck with terror, and felt as if the hand of the Almighty had been stretched out from heaven and laid upon him. He gave up his opposition. "Farel," it has been said, "gave Geneva to the Reformation, and Calvin to Geneva." He at once began his work, not taking the post of a preacher at first, but giving theological lectures of an exegetical sort in the Church of St. Peter. He composed hastily a catechism for the instruction of the young, which he deemed a thing essential in the guidance of a church. A confession of faith, drawn up by Farel, was presented to all the people, and by them formally adopted. A body of regulations relating to church services and discipline, containing stringent provisions, was likewise ratified and put in operation. Opposition to the doctrines and deviation from the practices thus sanctioned were penal offenses. A hairdresser, for example, for arranging a bride's hair in what was deemed an unseemly manner, was imprisoned for two days; and the mother, with two female friends, who had aided in the process, suffered the same penalty. Dancing and card playing were also punished by the magistrate. They were not wrong in themselves, Calvin said, but they had been so abused that there was no other course but to prohibit them altogether. He who so dreaded a tumult, not only had to encounter Anabaptist fanatics who appeared in Geneva, but soon found himself, with his associates, in conflict with the government, and with the majority of the citizens who rebelled against the strictness of the new regime.[1] At the

[1] He was compelled, much to his mortification, to withstand an attack of a different kind from another quarter. He was charged with Arianism and Sabellianism. See Henry, i. 178 seq. Calvin was cautious as to the terms which he used on the subject of the Trinity, and did not insist on the word *person*. See *Institutes*, b. i. xiii. 5. For his opinion of the Athanasian creed, see Kampschulte, i. 297.

head of the party of opposition, or of the Libertines, as they were styled by the supporters of Calvin, were Amy Perrin, Vandel, and Jean Philippe, who had been among the first advocates of the Reformation. In their ranks were many of the Confederates, or *Eidgenossen*, who had fought for the independence of the city. At Geneva, the baptismal font, the four festivals of Christmas, New Year's Day, the Annunciation, and the Ascension, and the use of unleavened bread in the sacrament, all of which was retained in Berne, had been discarded. The opponents of the new system called for the restoration of the Bernese ceremonies. Finding themselves thwarted by the authorities in the enforcement of church discipline, on Easter Sunday (1538), the ministers, Calvin, Farel, and Viret, preached in spite of the prohibition of the Syndics, and also took the bold step of refusing to administer the sacrament. Thereupon, by a vote of the Council, which was confirmed the next day by the general assembly of the citizens, they were banished from the city. Failing in their efforts to secure the intervention of Berne, and in other negotiations having reference to their restoration, they parted from one another. Farel went to Neufchâtel, and Calvin found a cordial reception in Strasburg. It was a general feeling, in which Calvin himself shared, that the preachers had gone imprudently far in their requirements. But the joy of Calvin at being delivered from the anxieties which he had suffered, and in finding himself at liberty to devote himself to his books, was greater, he says, than under the circumstances was becoming. But soon he was solicited by Bucer to take charge of the church of French refugees who were at Strasburg. Once more he was intimidated by Bucer's earnest appeal, who reminded him of the example of the fugitive prophet, Jonah. Though his pecuniary support was small, so that he was compelled to take lodgers and even to sell his books to get the means of living, he was satisfied and happy. While at Strasburg, he was brought into intercourse with the Saxon theologians at the religious conferences held between the years 1539 and 1541, at Frankfort, at Worms, and at Hagenau, and in connection with the Diet at Ratisbon, where Contarini appeared as the representative of the Pope. Like Luther, Calvin had no faith in the practicableness of a compromise with the Catholics, and the negotiations became more and more irksome to him.

His ignorance of the German language occasioned him some embarrassment. His talents and learning were fully recognized by the German theologians, and with Melancthon he formed a friendship which continued with a temporary, partial interruption, until they were separated by death. To the compromises of the Leipsic Interim, Calvin was inflexibly opposed. On the great controverted point of the Eucharist, he and Melancthon were agreed, and the latter confided to him the anxieties which weighed heavily upon him on account of the jealousy on the Lutheran side, which was awakened by his change of opinion. With Luther, Calvin never came into personal contact; but he was delighted to hear that the Saxon leader had read some of his books with "singular satisfaction," had betrayed no irritation at his difference on the question of the Supper, and had expressed a high degree of confidence in his ability to be useful to the Church. He thought Luther a much greater man than Zwingli, but that both were one-sided and too much under the sway of prejudice in their combat upon the Eucharist. He exclaims that he should never cease to revere Luther, if Luther were to call him a devil.[1] When called upon at a later day, after the death of Melancthon, to take the field against bigoted Lutherans, he breaks out with the exclamation: "O Philip Melancthon, I direct my words to thee who now livest before God with Jesus Christ, and there art waiting for us till we are gathered with thee to that blessed rest! A hundred times hast thou said, when, wearied with labor and oppressed with anxieties, thou hast laid thy head affectionately upon my bosom: 'O that, O that I might die upon this bosom!'" But notwithstanding their friendship, Melancthon could not be prevailed on to express himself in favor of Calvin's doctrine of predestination, though the latter dedicated to him, in flattering terms, a treatise on the subject, and by letters sought to enlist his support. Calvin was bringing in, Melancthon wrote to a friend, the Stoic doctrine of fate.[2] When Bolsec was taken into custody for vehemently attacking this doctrine in public, Melancthon wrote to Camerarius that they had put a man in prison at Geneva for not agreeing with Zeno.[3]

[1] Henry, ii. 352. [2] *Corp. Ref.*, vii. 392.

[3] Melancthon said that they had revived the fatalistic doctrine of Laurentius Valla. This, also, was one of the most offensive accusations of Bolsec.

The relations of Calvin to the friends of Zwingli and to the churches which had been established under his auspices were for a while unsettled. Calvin's Eucharistic doctrine differed from that of the Zurich reformer, and he was suspected of an intention to introduce the Lutheran theory. He succeeded in convincing them that this suspicion was groundless, and in bringing about a union through the acceptance of common formularies. The fact that Zwingli had rather professed the doctrine of predestination as a philosophical theorem, than brought it forward in popular teaching, required special exertions on the part of Calvin to quiet the misgivings of the Swiss respecting this point also.[1] In this effort he was likewise successful. Yet Berne, partly from the disfavor which it felt towards minor peculiarities of the Genevan cultus, but chiefly owing to the disappointment of political schemes, never treated Calvin with entire confidence and friendliness.

While at Strasburg Calvin was married to the widow of an Anabaptist preacher whom he had converted. Several previous attempts to negotiate a marriage, in which he had proceeded in quite businesslike spirit, with no outlay of sentiment, had from various causes proved abortive. The lady whom he married appears to have been a person of rare worth, his life with her was one of uninterrupted harmony; and when, nine years after their marriage, she died, his grief proved the tenderness of his attachment. His only child, a son, lived but a short time. It may be remarked here that Calvin was far from being unsusceptible to friendship. With Farel and Viret he was united in the closest bonds of intimacy. Though schooled to submission, when he hears of the death of one after another of his friends, he gives expression to his sorrow, sometimes in pathetic language. Beza loved him as a father.

Three years after his expulsion he was recalled to Geneva by the united voices of the government and people. The distracted condition of the city caused all eyes to turn to him as the only hope. Disorder and vice had been on the increase.

[1] Calvin criticises Zwingli's treatment of this doctrine, in a letter to Bullinger (Bonnet, cclxxxix.). The lukewarmness of the Swiss churches in the case of Bolsec was very vexatious to Calvin, as this and other letters show. The correspondence on this case instructively exhibits the unwillingness of the Zwinglian churches to press the doctrine of predestination, as Calvin would wish. Their expressions of sympathy were very qualified and constrained. Bullinger took quite another tone in reference to Servetus, where the doctrine of the Trinity was assailed.

Scenes of licentiousness and violence were witnessed by day and by night in the streets. The Catholics were hoping to see the old religion restored. There was a prospect that Berne would find its profit in the anarchical situation of its neighbor, and establish its control in Geneva. Of the four Syndics who had been active in the banishment of the preachers, one had broken his neck by a fall from a window, another had been executed for murder, and the remaining two had been banished on suspicion of treason. The consciences of many were alarmed at these occurrences. Meantime Cardinal Sadolet, Bishop of Carpentras, addressed to the Senate a very persuasive letter, free from all acrimony, and couched in a flattering style, for the purpose of bringing the city back to the fold of the Catholic Church. To this document Calvin published a masterly reply, in which he expressed his undying interest in the welfare of the Genevan Church, and reviewed the Protestant controversy with singular force and clearness. "Here is a work," said Luther, on reading it, "that has hands and feet." The personal reminiscences relating to his conversion, which are interwoven, make it, as a contribution to his biography, only second in importance to the Preface to the Psalms. It made a most favorable impression at Geneva, and an edition of it was published by the authorities. The city, torn by faction, with a government too weak to exercise effective control, turned to the banished preacher, who had never been without a body of warm adherents, however overborne in the excitement that attended his expulsion. Here was another instance in which Providence seemed to interpose to baffle his cherished plans, and to use him for a purpose not his own. He could not think of going back without a shudder. The recollection of his conflicts there, and of the troubles of conscience he had suffered, was dreadful to him.[1] But he could not long withstand the unanimous opinion of his friends and the earnest importunities of the Genevan Senate and people. To the solicitations of the deputies who followed him from Strasburg to Worms, he answered more with tears than words. His consent was at length obtained, and once more he took up his abode in Geneva, there to live for the remainder of his days.

Of the system of ecclesiastical and civil order which was formed under his influence, only the outlines can here be given.

[1] See his Letters, Bonnet, i. 163, 167, 207, 244.

His idea was that the Church should be distinct from the State, but that both should be intimately connected and mutually coöperative for a common end — the realization of the kingdom of God in the lives of the people. The Church was to infuse a religious spirit into the State; the State was to uphold and foster the interests of the Church. For the instruction of the people, preachers, whose qualifications have been put to a thorough test, must be appointed, and respect for them and attention to their ministrations must be enforced by law. So the training of the children in the catechism is indispensable, and this must likewise be secured, if necessary, by the intervention of the magistrate. The Three Councils, or Senates, the Little Council, or Council of Twenty-five, the Council of Sixty, and the Council of Two Hundred, which had existed before, were not abolished, but their functions and relative prerogatives were materially changed. The drift of all the political changes was to concentrate power in the hands of the Little Council, and to take it away from the other bodies, and especially from the General Council, or popular assembly of the citizens. Ecclesiastical discipline was in the hands of the Consistory, a body composed of the preachers, who at first were six in number, and of twice as many laymen; the laymen being nominated by the preachers and chosen annually by the Little Council, but the General Council having a veto upon their appointment. Calvin thus revived, under a peculiar form, the Eldership in the Church. It had existed, to be sure, in some of the Zwinglian Churches, but not as an effective organization. The preachers were chosen by the ministers already in office; they gave proof of their qualifications by publicly preaching a sermon, at which two members of the Little Council were present. If the ministers approved of the learning of the candidate, they presented him to the Council, and his election having been sanctioned by that body, eight days were given to the people, in which they might bring forward objections, if they had any, to his appointment. The Consistory had jurisdiction in matrimonial causes. To this body was committed a moral censorship that extended over the entire life of every inhabitant. It was a court before which any one might be summoned, and which could not be treated with contumacy or disrespect without bringing upon the offender civil penalties. The power of excommunication

was in its hands; and excommunication, if it continued beyond a certain time, was likewise followed by penal consequences. Though ostensibly purely spiritual in its function, the Consistory might hand over to the magistrate transgressors whose offenses were deemed to be grave, or who refused to submit to correction. The city was divided into districts, and in each of them a preacher and elder had superintendence, the ordinance being that at least once in a year every family must be visited, and receive such admonition, counsel, or comfort as its condition might call for. Every sick person was required to send for the minister. From this vigilant, stringent, universal supervision there was no escape. There was no respect for persons; the high and the low, the rich and the poor, were alike subjected to one inflexible rule. In the Consistory, by tacit consent, Calvin was the unofficial leader. The ministers — the Venerable Company, as they were styled — met together for mutual fraternal censure. Candidates for the ministry were examined and ordained by them. They were to be kept up to a high standard of professional qualifications and of conduct. Calvin, it may be observed, felt the importance of an effective delivery: he speaks against the reading of sermons.[1]

In the framing of the civil laws, Calvin had a controlling influence. His legal education qualified him for such a work, and so great was the respect entertained for him that he was made, not by any effort of his own, the virtual legislator of the city. The minutest affairs engaged his attention. Regulations for the watching of the gates, and for the suppression of fires, are found in his handwriting. An examination of the Genevan code shows the strong influence of the Mosaic legislation on Calvin's conception of a well-ordered community. Both the special statutes and the general theocratic character of the Hebrew commonwealth were never out of sight.[2] In all points Calvin did not find it practicable to conform to his own theories. One of his cardinal principles is that to the congregation belongs the choice of its religious teachers; but it was provided at Geneva that the Collegium, or Society of Preachers, should select persons to fill vacancies, and to the congregation was left only a veto, which was regarded more as a nominal than a real prerogative. Whatever may have been the influence of Calvinism

[1] Henry, ii. 195. [2] Kampschulte, i. 417.

on society, Calvin himself was unfavorable to democracy.[1] It is remarkable that almost at the beginning of his earliest writing, the Commentary on Seneca, there is an expression of contempt for the populace. His experiences at Geneva, and especially the dangers to which his civil as well as ecclesiastical system would be liable if it were at the disposal of a popular assembly, confirmed his inclination to an aristocratic or oligarchic constitution.

Calvin had begun, after his return, with moderation, with no manifestation of vindictiveness, and without undertaking to remove the other preachers who had been appointed by the opposite party in his absence. But symptoms of disaffection were not long in appearing. The more the new system was developed in its characteristic features, the more loud grew the opposition. Let us glance at the parties in this long-continued conflict. Against Calvin were the Libertines, as they were styled. They consisted of two different classes. There were the fanatical Antinomians, an offshoot from the sect of the Free Spirit, who combined pantheistic theology with a lax morality, in which the marriage relation was practically subverted and a theory allied to the modern "free love" was more or less openly avowed and practiced. Their number was sufficient to form a dangerous faction, and it appears to be proved that among them were persons in affluent circumstances and possessed of much influence. United with the "Spirituels," as this class of Libertines was termed, were the Patriots, as they styled themselves; those who were for maintaining the democratic constitution, and jealous of the Frenchmen and other foreigners who had migrated in large numbers to Geneva, and to whom the supporters of Calvin were for giving the rights of citizens. The licentious free-thinkers, the native Genevese of democratic proclivities and opposed to the granting of political power to the immigrants, and the multitude who chafed under the new restraints put upon them, gradually combined against the new system and the man who was its principal author. On the other side were those who preferred the order, independence, morality, and temporal prosperity which were the fruit of the new order of things, and, in the existing circumstances, were inseparable from it, and especially all who thoroughly accepted

[1] For his opinion of "the people," see Kampschulte, i. 419.

the Protestant system of doctrine as expounded by Calvin. In the ranks of this party, which maintained its ascendency, though not without perilous struggles, were the numerous foreigners, who had been, for the most part, driven from their homes by persecution, and had been drawn to Geneva by the presence of Calvin and by the religious system established there. On a single occasion not less than three hundred of these were naturalized. That widespread disaffection should exist was inevitable. The attempt was made to extend over a city of twenty thousand inhabitants, wonted to freedom and little fond of restraint, the strict discipline of a Calvinistic church. Not only profaneness and drunkenness, but recreations which had been considered innocent, and divergent theological doctrines, if the effort was made to disseminate them, were severely punished. In 1568, under the stern code which was established under the auspices of Calvin, a child was beheaded for striking its father and mother. A child sixteen years old, for *attempting* to strike its mother, was sentenced to death, but, on account of its youth, the sentence was commuted, and, having been publicly whipped, with a cord about its neck, it was banished from the city. In 1565 a woman was chastised with rods for singing secular songs to the melody of the Psalms. In 1579 a cultivated gentleman was imprisoned for twenty-four hours because he was found reading Poggio, and, having been compelled to burn the book, he was expelled from the city. Dancing, and the manufacture or use of cards, and of nine-pins, brought down upon the delinquent the vengeance of the laws. Even those who looked upon a dance were not exempt from punishment. The prevalence of gambling and the indecent occurrences at balls furnished the ground for these stringent enactments. To give the names of Catholic saints to children was a penal offense. In criminal processes torture was freely used, according to the custom of the times, to elicit testimony and confession; and death by fire was the penalty of heresy. It is no wonder that the prisons became filled and the executioner was kept busy.[1]

The suppression of outspoken religious dissent by force was an inevitable result of the principles on which the Genevan estate was established. The Reformers can never be fairly judged unless it is kept in mind that they were strangers to the limited

[1] Kampschulte (i. 426, 428) gives statistics.

idea of the proper function of the State, which has come into vogue in more recent times. The ancient religions were all state religions. It was a universal conception that a nation, like a family, must profess but one faith, and practice the same religious rites. The toleration of the ancients, which has been lauded by modern skeptical writers, was only such as polytheism requires. The worship of a nation was sacred within its territory and among its own people. But to introduce foreign rites, or make proselytes of Roman citizens, was contrary to Roman law, and was severely punished. This policy was conformed to the general feeling of antiquity. The early Christian fathers, as Tertullian and Cyprian, speak against coercion in matters of religion.[1] After the downfall of heathenism, the successors of Constantine enforced conformity to the religion of the Empire; and Constantine himself did the same within the pale of the Christian Church, as is seen in the Arian controversy. There was persecution both on the orthodox and on the Arian side. Severe laws were enacted against the Manichæans and Donatists. Augustine, who in his earlier writings had opposed the use of force for the spread of truth, or the extirpation of error, altered his views in the Donatist controversy. He would not have capital punishment inflicted, but would confine the penalties of heresy to imprisonment or banishment, the confiscation of goods and civil disabilities. Theodosius has the unenviable distinction of incorporating the theory of persecution in an elaborate code, which threatened death to heretics; and in his reign the term *Inquisitors* of the faith first appears.[2] The feeling of the necessity of uniformity in religious belief and worship, and of the obligation of rulers to punish and to exterminate infidelity and heresy within their dominions, was universal in the Middle Ages. Innocent III. enforced this obligation upon princes under the threat of excommunication, and of the forfeiture of their crowns and dominions. In 1208 he established the Inquisition. It is true that the Church kept up the custom of asking the magistrate to spare the life of the condemned heretic; but it was an empty formality. The Church inculcated the lawfulness of the severest punishments in such cases. Leo X., in his Bull against

[1] The passages are given in Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis*, I. ii.

[2] For the history of persecution, see Limborch, I. iii.; Gibbon, ch. xxvii.; the art. "Hæresie" in Herzog, *Realencycl. d. Theol.* Lecky, *History of Rationalism in Europe*, ch. iv. (ii.).

Luther, in 1520, explicitly condemns the proposition: "Hæreticos comburere est contra voluntatem Spiritus." No historical student needs to be told what an incalculable amount of evil has been wrought by Catholics and by Protestants, from a mistaken belief in the perpetual validity of the Mosaic civil legislation, and from a confounding of the spirit of the old dispensation with that of the new — an overlooking of the progressive character of Divine Revelation. The Reformers held that offenses against the first table of the law, not less than the second, fall under the jurisdiction of the magistrate. To protect and foster pure religion, and to put down false religion, was that part of his office to which he was most sacredly bound. Occasional utterances, it is true, which seem harbingers of a better day, fell from the lips of Protestant leaders. Zwingli was not disposed to persecution. Luther said, in reference to the prohibition of his version of the New Testament: "Over the souls of men God can and will have no one rule save Himself alone;" and in his book against the Anabaptists, he says: "It is not right that they should so shockingly murder, burn, and cruelly slay such wretched people; they should let every one believe what he will; with the Scripture and God's Word, they should check and withstand them; with fire they will accomplish little. The executioners on this plan would be the most learned doctors." [1] But these noble words rather express the dictates of Luther's humane impulses than definite principles by which he would consistently abide. It is often charged upon the Protestants themselves as a flagrant inconsistency that whilst they were persecuted themselves, they were willing, and sometimes eager, to persecute others. So far is Calvin from being impressed with this incongruity, that he writes: "Seeing that the defenders of the Papacy are so bitter and bold in behalf of their superstitions, that in their atrocious fury they shed the blood of the innocent, it should shame Christian magistrates that in the protection of certain truth they are entirely destitute of spirit." [2] The repressive measures of Catholic rulers were an example for Protestant rulers to emulate! There were voices occasionally raised in favor of toleration. The case of Servetus, probably, tended more than any single event to produce wiser and more charitable views on this subject. Free thinkers, who had no

[1] Walch, x. 461, 374.

[2] Bonnet, letter cccxxv.

convictions for which they would die themselves, — the apostles of indifference, — were naturally early in the field in favor of the rights of opinion. But religious toleration could never obtain a general sway until the limitations of human responsibility, and the limited function to which the State is properly restricted, were better understood. A more enlightened charity, which makes larger allowance for diversities of intellectual view, is doubtless a powerful auxiliary in effecting this salutary change.[1]

The conflicts through which Calvin had to pass in upholding and firmly establishing the Genevan theocracy would have broken down any other than a man of iron. Personal indignities were heaped upon him. The dogs in the street were named after him. Every device was undertaken in order to intimidate him. As he sat at his study table late at night, a gun would be discharged under his window. In one night fifty shots were fired before his house. On one occasion he walked into the midst of an excited mob and offered his breast to their daggers.

The case of Bolsec, who was arrested and banished for violently attacking the preachers on the subject of predestination, has already been referred to. Another instance, somewhat similar, was the controversy with Castellio. Castellio was a highly cultivated scholar whom Calvin had brought from Strasburg to take charge of the Geneva school. He was desirous of becoming a minister, but Calvin objected on account of his views on the Song of Solomon, which he thought should be struck from the canon, and his opposition to the passage of the creed respecting the descent of Christ into hell. The result was that Castellio at length made a public attack upon the preachers, charging them with intolerance, and less justly, with other grave faults. He accused Calvin of a love of power. Whether the charge were

[1] Lecky, in common with other writers at the present day, makes persecution the necessary result of undoubting convictions on the subject of religion, coupled with a belief that moral obliquity is involved in holding opposite views. These writers would make skepticism essential to the exercise of toleration. See Lecky's quotation from C. J. Fox (vol. ii. p. 20). But if this be true, how shall we account for the opposition to the spirit of persecution, which these very writers attribute to the founders of Christianity — to Christ and the Apostles? Much that is ascribed to the influence of "Rationalism" is really due to the increasing power of Christianity, and to the better understanding of its precepts, and of the limits of the responsibility of society for the opinions and character of its members. There are two antidotes to uncharitableness and narrowness. The one is liberal culture; the other is that *high degree* of religion — of charity — which is delineated by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xiii. Either of these remedies against intolerance is consistent with a living, earnest faith.

true, Calvin wrote to Farel, he was willing to leave it to God to judge. The result was that Castellio, who had many points of excellence, was expelled from Geneva, and afterwards prosecuted in print a heated controversy with Calvin and Beza.[1] But these and all other instances of alleged persecution are overshadowed by the more notorious case of Servetus. Michael Servetus was born at Villeneuve, in Spain, in 1509, and was therefore of the same age as Calvin. According to his own statement, he was attached, for a while, when a youth, to the service of Quintana, the chaplain of Charles V., and witnessed the stately ceremonies at the coronation of the Emperor at Bologna. He was sent by his father to Toulouse to study law; but his mind turned to theological speculation, and, in connection with other scholars of his acquaintance, he read the Scriptures and the Fathers, especially the writers of the ante-Nicene period. He also delved in judicial astrology, in which he was a believer. Of an original, inquisitive mind, adventurous and independent in his thinking, he convinced himself of the groundlessness of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church; but he was not satisfied with the Protestant theology, especially on the subject of the Trinity. Going to Basel he formed an acquaintance with Œcolampadius, who expressed a strong dislike of his notions. Zwingli, whom Œcolampadius consulted, said that such notions would subvert the Christian religion, but seems to have discountenanced a resort to force for the suppression of them.[2] The book of Servetus on the "Errors of the Trinity," appeared in 1531. In it he defended a view closely allied to the Sabellian theory, and an idea of the incarnation in which the common belief of two natures in Christ had no place. He endeavored to draw Calvin into a correspondence, but became angry at the manner in which Calvin treated him and his speculations. He wrote Calvin a number of letters well stored with invectives against the prevalent conceptions of Christian doctrine, as well as against Calvin personally. At length he returned to Paris, where he had previously studied at the same time that Calvin was there, and under

[1] When Calvin was excited, he was a match for Luther in the use of vituperative epithets. The opprobrious names which he applies to Castellio the latter collects in a long list. The origin of Calvin's disputes with Castellio — Calvin's dissatisfaction with his translation of the New Testament — is given in the letter to Viret, Bonnet, i. 326. See, also, i. 316, 379, 392. A fair account of the controversy is given by Dyer, 169 seq.

[2] Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, p. 17.

the assumed name of Villanovus, derived from the village where he was born, he prosecuted his studies in natural science and medicine, for which he had a remarkable aptitude. He divined the true method of the circulation of the blood, almost anticipating the later discovery of Harvey.[1] As a practitioner of medicine he stood in high repute. After repeatedly changing his name and residence, he finally took up his abode in Vienne, in the south of France, where he was hospitably received by the Archbishop, and long lived in the lucrative practice of his profession. During all this time, in the aggregate more than twenty years, he conformed outwardly to the Catholic Church, attended mass, and was not suspected of heresy. Here he finished a book, not less obnoxious than the first, entitled "The Restoration of Christianity" — Christianismi Restitutio — and not being able to get it printed in Basel, he bribed the Archbishop's own printer and two of his assistants to print it for him secretly. He superintended the press, and sent copies of the anonymous book to various places for sale, not forgetting to dispatch one or more copies as presents to the Genevan theologians. In this work his conception of the person of Christ is somewhat modified; its doctrine makes a nearer approach to Pantheistic theories.[2] The two grand hindrances in the way of the spread of Christianity were declared to be the doctrine of the Trinity and that of Infant Baptism. The manuscript of the first draft of the work had been sent to Calvin at an earlier day. A French refugee residing at Geneva, by the name of Guillaume Trie, in a letter to Antoine Arneys, a Roman Catholic relative at Lyons, made reference to Servetus as the author of this pestiferous book, and as, nevertheless, enjoying immunity in a Church that pretended to be zealous for the extirpation of heresy. Arneys carried the information to the Archbishop of Lyons. Servetus was arrested; and an ecclesiastical court was constituted for his trial. Some pages of an annotated copy of the "Institutes," which he had long before sent to Calvin, and a parcel of his letters were transmitted from Geneva by Trie, for the purpose of establishing the charge which he had indirectly caused to be made. Trie pre-

[1] Henry, *Leben Calvins*, iii. Beil. 59.

[2] "Es gibt kaum ein anderes System, das so sehr wie das Servets als ein pantheistisches bezeichnet zu werden verdient in dem gewöhnlich mit diesem Worte verbundenen Sinn." — Baur, *Die christl. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit*, etc., III. i. 2, p. 86.

vailed on Calvin to grant him this additional evidence. Servetus and the printers with him had sworn that they knew nothing of the book which they had published. Servetus also swore that he was not the person who had written the book on the "Errors of the Trinity." But when the Genevan documents arrived, he saw that conviction was inevitable, and contrived to escape from his jailer. The Vienne court had to content itself with seizing his property and burning his effigy. We know Calvin's disposition towards him; for in a letter to Farel he had once said that if his authority was of any avail, in case Servetus were to come to Geneva, he should not go away alive.[1]

Servetus, having escaped from Vienne, after a few months actually appeared in Geneva and took lodgings in an inn near one of the gates. He had been there for a month without being recognized, when Calvin was informed of his presence, and procured his arrest. A scribe of Calvin made the accusation. Ultimately, Calvin and all the other preachers were brought face to face with the prisoner before the Senate which was to sit in judgment upon him. In the subsequent proceedings he defended his theological opinions with much acuteness, but with a strange outpouring of violent denunciation.[2] His propositions relative to the participation of all things in the Deity, and the identity of the world with God, although he made the embodiment of the primordial essence in the world to spring from a volition, were couched in phraseology which made them seem to his accusers in the highest degree dangerous and repulsive.[3] He caricatured the Church doctrine of the Trinity by the most offensive comparisons. His ideas were out of relation to the existing philosophy and theology, and were an anticipation of phases of speculation of a much later date. His physical theories were interwoven with his theology. His maxim, that "no force acts except by contact," was connected with his doctrine

[1] February 13, 1546. Bonnet, ii. 19.

[2] Dyer, a writer not at all disposed to excuse Calvin, says (p. 337) of the indorsements made by Servetus on the list of thirty-eight heretical propositions which Calvin had extracted from his writings: "The replies of Servetus to this document are very insolent, and seem almost like the productions of a madman." These replies may be read in the new edition of Calvin's works, viii. 519 seq.

[3] "Man kann sich daher nicht wundern, dass auch die Gegner an diesem so offen vor Augen liegenden Character des Systems den grössten Anstos nahmn." — Baur, *Ibid.*, p. 103.

of the substantial communication of the Deity to all things; and he told Calvin contemptuously that if he only understood natural science, he could comprehend this subject. While he was undergoing his trial, a messenger arrived from the tribunal at Vienne to demand their escaped prisoner. There was no safety for him with Papist or Protestant! He chose to remain and take his chance where he was. It is not improbable that his boldness and vehemence were inspired by suggestions from the Libertine party, and that he felt that they stood at his back.[1] Calvin was far from being omnipotent in Geneva at this time. He was, in fact, in the very crisis of his conflict with his adversaries. It was on the 27th of August, 1553, that he denounced Servetus from the pulpit; he had been arrested on the 13th of the same month. On the 3d of September, Calvin refused the Lord's Supper to the younger Berthelier, a leader of the Libertines. So strong was this party, that had the cause of Servetus been carried, as was attempted, to the Council of Two Hundred, Servetus would have escaped. He was extremely bold, and demanded that Calvin should be banished for bringing a malicious accusation, and that his property should be handed over to him. Contrary to his expectation, he was condemned. He called Calvin to his prison, and asked pardon for his personal treatment of him; but all attempts to extort from him a retraction of his doctrines, whether made by Calvin or by Farel before the execution of the sentence, were ineffectual. He adhered to his opinions with heroic constancy, and was burned at the stake on the morning of the 27th of October, 1553.

On the one hand, it is not true that Calvin arranged that the mode of his death should be needlessly painful. He made the attempt to have it mitigated; probably that the sword might be used instead of the fagot. And notwithstanding the previous threat, to which reference has been made, it is likely that he expected, and he had reason to expect, that Servetus would recant. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that he yielded to the solicitation of Trie, and supplied the documentary evidence which went from Geneva to the court at Vienne. He caused the arrest of Servetus at Geneva, and it is a violation of

[1] Guizot expresses the decided opinion that Servetus went to Geneva relying on the Libertines, and that they expected support from him. *St. Louis and Calvin*, p. 313. But there is no good evidence of any previous understanding between him and them.

historical truth to say that he did not desire his execution.[1] The infliction of capital punishment on one whom he considered a blasphemer, as well as an assailant of the fundamental truths of Christianity, was in his judgment right. In the defense of the doctrine of the Trinity against Servetus, which Calvin published in 1554, he enters into a formal argument in favor of the capital punishment of contumacious heretics by the civil authority. He thinks that if Roman Catholic rulers slay the innocent, this is no reason why better and more enlightened magistrates should spare the guilty. The whole discussion proves that the arguments for toleration, both from Scripture and reason, were not unknown to him, for he tries to answer them. He makes his appeal, in great part, to the Old Testament. Guizot thus pronounces upon the case of Servetus and Calvin: "It was their tragical destiny to enter into mortal combat as the champions of two great causes. It is my profound conviction that Calvin's cause was the good one; that it was the cause of morality, of social order, of civilization. Servetus was the representative of a system false in itself, superficial under the pretense of science, and destructive alike of social dignity in the individual and of moral order in human society. In their disastrous encounter, Calvin was conscientiously faithful to what he believed to be truth and duty; but he was hard, much more influenced by violent animosity than he imagined, and devoid alike of sympathy and generosity. Servetus was sincere and resolute in his conviction, but he was a frivolous, presumptuous, vain, and envious man, capable, in time of need, of resorting to artifice and untruth. Servetus obtained the honor of being one of the few martyrs to intellectual liberty; whilst Calvin, who was undoubtedly one of those who did most toward the establishment of religious liberty, had the misfortune to ignore his adversary's right to liberty of belief."[2] The forbearance of Calvin toward Lælius Socinus has been sometimes considered a proof that he was actuated by personal vindictiveness in relation to Servetus. But Calvin, widely as he might differ from Socinus,

[1] We have already cited his letter to Farel, of February 13, 1546. After the arrest of Servetus, Calvin wrote to Farel (August 20, 1553), saying: "I hope (spero) the sentence will at least be capital; but desire the atrocity of the punishment to be abated." He wished him to be put to death, but not by fire. Calvin published an elaborate work in defense of the proceeding. Henry has mistranslated the above passage: see Dyer, *Life of Calvin*, p. 339.

[2] *St. Louis and Calvin*, c. xix. p. 326.

recognized in him a sobriety, a moral respectability, which he wholly missed in the restless, visionary, passionate physician of Villeneuve. It was the diversity of character in the two men, and the different methods which they adopted to spread their doctrines, much more than any resentment which Calvin might feel in consequence of the attacks of Servetus — whom he looked down upon as a wild, mischievous dreamer — that made him so courteous and lenient to Socinus.

The execution of Servetus, with a few notable exceptions, was approved by the Christian world. Bullinger, the friend and successor of Zwingli, justified it. Even Melancthon gave it his sanction. The rise of infidel and fanatical sects in the path of the Reformation, as an incidental consequence of the movement, and the disposition of opponents to identify it with these manifestations, made the Protestants the more solicitous to demonstrate their hostility to them, and their fidelity to the principal articles of the Christian faith. In rejecting infant baptism, and in the terms of his proposition respecting the identity of the world with God, Servetus was at one with the Libertine free-thinkers. "He held with the Anabaptists," said the Genevan Senate, and must suffer;[1] although Servetus asserted that he had always condemned the opposition made by the Anabaptists to the civil magistrate.

The conflict with the Libertine faction did not end with the condemnation of Servetus. The courage and determination of a Hildebrand were required to stem the opposition which Calvin had to meet. An attempt to overthrow the power of the Consistory, by interposing the authority of the Senate, was only baffled by his resolute refusal to admit to the sacrament persons judged to be unworthy. Finally, the efforts of the Libertine party culminated in 1555, in an armed conspiracy under the lead of Perrin, who had held the highest offices in the city; and the complete overthrow of this insurrection was the deathblow

[1] Upon the life and opinions of Servetus, and the circumstances of his trial and death, see Mosheim, *Ketzergeschichte*, ii. (1748), and *Neue Nachrichten von dem berühmten span. Arzte, M. Serveto* (1750); Trechsel, *Die Anti-trinitarier*, and art. "Servet" in Herzog's *Realencl.*; Dyer, *Life of Calvin*, chs. ix. and x.; Henry, *Leben Calvins*, III. i.; Baur, *Die christl. Lehre von d. Dreieinigkeit*, etc., t. iii. p. 54 seq.; Dorner, *Entwicklungsch. d. Lehre von d. Person Christi*, ii. 649 seq.; R. Willis, *Servetus and Calvin* (1877); Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, vii. 681 seq. The letters of Servetus to Calvin, together with the Minutes of his Trial at Geneva, are given in the new edition of the Works of Calvin (by Baum, Cunitz, and Reuss), vol. viii. (1870).

of the party. In the Preface to the Psalms, Calvin makes a pathetic reference to the stormy scenes which he — by nature "unwarlike and timorous" — had been compelled to pass through; to the sorrow which he felt in the destruction of those whom he would have preferred to save; and to the multiplied calumnies that his enemies persistently heaped upon him.[1] "To my power," he says, "which they envy — O that they were the successors!" "If I cannot persuade them while I am alive that I am not avaricious, my death, at least, will convince them of it." His entire property after his death amounted to less than two hundred dollars!

At the same time that he was waging this domestic contest, he was exerting a vast influence as a religious teacher within the city and all over Europe. Besides preaching every day of each alternate week, he gave weekly three theological lectures. His memory was so tenacious that if he had once seen a person, he recognized him immediately years afterwards, and if interrupted while dictating, he could resume his task, after an interval of hours, at the point where he had left it, without aid from his amanuensis. Hence, he was able to discourse, even upon the prophets, where numerous historical references were involved, without the aid of a scrap of paper, and with nothing before him but the text. Being troubled with asthma, he spoke slowly, so that his lectures, as well as many of his sermons, were taken down, word for word, as they were delivered. Hundreds of auditors from the various countries of Europe flocked to Geneva to listen to his instructions. Protestant exiles in great numbers, many of whom were men of influence, of whom Knox was one, found a refuge there, and went back to their homes bearing the impress which he had stamped upon them. Under Calvin's influence, Geneva became to the Romanic what Wittenberg was to the Lutheran nations. The school of which Castellio was the head did not flourish after he left it; but, in 1558, a gymnasium was established, and in the following year the

[1] Kampschulte states that when the pestilence raged at Geneva in 1543, Calvin declined, from fear, to go to the pest-house to minister to the sick and dying. (*Johann Calvin*, i. 484.) But Beza, than whom there is no better witness, states that Calvin offered himself for this service, but the Senate would not permit him to undertake it; *Vita Calvini*, ix. For other contemporary proof, see Bonnet, *Letters of Calvin*, i. 334, n. 3. See also Henry, ii. 43. But Kampschulte himself quotes the act of the Council, withholding Calvin from this service which involved almost certain death (p. 486, n. 2).

Academy of Theology was founded, and Beza placed over it. The writings of Calvin were circulated in every country of Europe. By his correspondence, moreover, his powerful influence was brought to bear directly upon the leaders of the reformatory movement everywhere. In England and France, in Scotland and Poland and Italy, on the roll of his correspondents were princes and nobles, as well as theologians. His counsels were called for and prized in matters of critical importance. He writes to Edward VI. and Elizabeth, to Somerset and Cranmer. But especially in the affairs of the Reformation in France his agency was predominant. Geneva was the hearthstone of French Protestantism. It was there that its preachers were trained. The principal men in the Huguenot party looked up to Calvin as to an oracle. But he was strongly averse to a resort to arms and to a dependence on political agencies and expedients. His instincts were, in this respect, in full accord with those of Luther. It would be impossible to describe his connection with the Huguenot struggle, without narrating the entire history of the French Reformation.

In the concluding years of Calvin's life, he had the satisfaction of seeing Geneva delivered from faction, and the institutions of education, which he had planted, in a flourishing condition. The grievous maladies that afflicted him did not move him to diminish the prodigious labors which, to other men in like circumstances, would have been unendurable. It had been his habit when the day had been consumed in giving sermons and lectures; in the sessions of the Consistory over which he presided; in attending upon the Senate, at their request, to take part in their deliberations; in receiving and answering letters that poured in upon him from every quarter; in conferring with the numerous visitors who sought his advice or came to him from different countries — it had been his habit, when night came, to devote himself, with a sense of relief, to the studies which were ever most accordant with his taste, and to the composition of his books. For a long time, in the closing period of his life, he took but one meal in a day, and this was often omitted. He studied for hours in the morning, preached and then lectured, before taking a morsel of food. Too weak to sit up, he dictated to an amanuensis from his bed, or transacted business with those who came to consult him. When his body was utterly feeble,

when he was reduced to a shadow, his mind lost none of its clearness or energy. No complaint in reference to his physical sufferings was heard from him. His lofty and intrepid spirit triumphed over all physical infirmity. From his sick bed he regulated the affairs of the French Reformation. When he could no longer stand upon his feet, he was carried to church to partake of the Lord's Supper, and to a session of the Senate. Seeing that his end was near, he desired to meet this body for the last time. A celebrated artist has depicted the interview upon the canvas. The councilors gathered about his bed, and he addressed them. He thanked them for the tokens of honor which they had granted to him, and craved their forgiveness for outbreakings of anger which they had treated with so much forbearance. He could say with truth, that whatever might be his faults, he had served their republic with his whole soul. He had taught, he said, with no feeling of uncertainty respecting his doctrine, but sincerely and honestly, according to the Word of God. "Were it not so," he added, "I well know that the wrath of God would impend over my head." Courteously and solemnly, in a paternal tone, he warned them of the need of humility and of faithful vigilance to keep off the dangers that might threaten the State. "I know," he said, "the mind and walk of each one of you, and know that ye have all need of admonition. Much is wanting even to the best of you." He concluded with a fervent prayer, and took each one by the hand, as with tears they parted from him. Two days afterwards, he met the clergy of the city and of the neighborhood. He sat up in his bed and, having offered prayer, spoke to them. He began by saying that it might be thought that he was not in so bad a case as he supposed. "But I assure you," he added, "in all my former illnesses and sufferings, I have never felt myself so weak and sinking as now. When they lay me down upon the bed, my senses fail and I become faint." He referred to his past career in Geneva. When he came to this Church there was preaching, and that was all. They hunted up the images and burnt them, but of a Reformation there was nothing; all was insubordination and disorder. He had been obliged to go through tremendous conflicts. Sometimes in the night, he said, to terrify him, fifty or sixty shots had been fired before his door. "Think," he said, "what an impression that must make upon a

poor scholar, shy and timid as I then was, and at the bottom have always been." This last statement respecting his natural disposition, he repeated two or three times with emphasis. He adverted to his banishment and stay in Strasburg, but on his return the difficulties were not diminished. They had set their dogs on him, with the cry: "Seize him! seize him!" and his clothes and his flesh had been torn by them. "Although I am nothing," he proceeded to say, "I know that I have prevented more than three hundred riots which would have desolated Geneva." He asked their pardon for his many faults; in particular for his quickness, vehemence, and readiness to be angry. In regard to his teaching and his writings, he could say that God had given him the grace to go to work earnestly and systematically, so that he had not knowingly perverted or erroneously interpreted a single passage of the Scriptures. He had written for no personal end, but only to promote the honor of God. He gave them various exhortations relating to the obligations of their office; then took them each by the hand, and "we parted from him," says Beza, "with our eyes bathed in tears, and our hearts full of unspeakable grief." He died on the 27th of May, 1564. His piercing eye retained its brilliancy to the last. Apart from this, his face had long worn the look of death, and its appearance, as we are informed by Beza, was not perceptibly changed after the spirit had left the body. His last days were of a piece with his life. His whole course has been compared by Vinet to the growth of one rind of a tree from another, or to a chain of logical sequences. He was endued with a marvelous power of understanding, although the imagination and sentiments were less roundly developed. His systematic spirit fitted him to be the founder of an enduring school of thought. In this characteristic he may be compared with Aquinas. He has been appropriately styled the Aristotle of the Reformation. He was a perfectly honest man. He subjected his will to the eternal rule of right, as far as he could discover it. His motives were pure. He felt that God was near him, and sacrificed everything to obey the direction of Providence. The fear of God ruled in his soul; not a slavish fear, but a principle such as animated the prophets of the Old Covenant. The combination of his qualities was such that he could not fail to attract profound admiration and reverence from one

class of minds, and excite intense antipathy in another. There is no one of the Reformers who is spoken of, at this late day, with so much personal feeling, either of regard or aversion. But whoever studies his life and writings, especially the few passages in which he lets us into his confidence and appears to invite our sympathy, will acquire a growing sense of his intellectual and moral greatness, and a tender consideration for his errors.

In Calvinism, considered as a theological system, and contrasted with other types of Protestant theology, there is one characteristic, pervading principle. It is that of the sovereignty of God; not only his unlimited control, within the sphere of mind, as well as of matter, but the determination of His will, as the ultimate cause of the salvation of some, and of the abandonment of others to perdition.

In the constitution which Calvin created at Geneva, as it is seen in the light which the lapse of three centuries casts upon it, were two capital errors. First, the jurisdiction of the Church, its discipline over its members, was carried into the details of conduct, extended over personal and domestic life, to such a degree as unwarrantably to curtail individual liberty. Secondly, the power of coercion that was given to the civil authority subverted freedom in religious opinion and worship.

How is it, then, that Calvinism is acknowledged, even by its foes, to have promoted powerfully the cause of civil liberty? One reason lies in the boundary line which it drew between Church and State. Calvinism would not surrender the peculiar functions of the Church to the civil authority.[1] Whether the Church, or the Government, should regulate the administration of the Sacrament, and admit or reject the communicants, was the question which Calvin fought out with the authorities at Geneva. In this feature, Calvinism differed from the relation of the civil rulers to the Church, as established under the auspices of Zwingli, as well as of Luther, and from the Anglican system which originated under Henry VIII. In its theory of the respective powers of the Church and of the Magistrate, Calvinism approximated to the traditional view of the Catholic Church. In France, in Holland, in Scotland, in England, wherever Calvinism was planted, it had no scruples about resisting the tyranny of civil

[1] Calvin condemns Henry VIII. for styling himself the head of the Anglican Church. Kampschulte, i. 271.

rulers. This principle, in the long run, would inevitably conduce to the progress of civil freedom. It is certain that the distinction between Church and State, which was recognized from the conversion of Constantine, notwithstanding the long ages of intolerance and persecution that were to follow, was the first step, the necessary condition, in the development of religious liberty. First, it must be settled that the State shall not stretch its power over the Church, within its proper sphere; next, that that State shall not lend its power to the Church, as an executioner of ecclesiastical laws.

A second reason why Calvinism has been favorable to civil liberty is found in the republican character of its church organization. Laymen shared power with ministers. The people, the body of the congregation, took an active and responsible part in the choice of the clergy, and of all other officers. At Geneva, the alliance of the Church with the civil authority, and the circumstances in which Calvin was placed, reduced to a considerable extent the real power of the people in church affairs. Calvin did not realize his own theory. But elsewhere, especially in countries where Calvinism had to encounter the hostility of the State, the democratic tendencies of the system had full room for development. Men who were accustomed to rule themselves in the Church would claim the same privilege in the commonwealth.

Another source of the influence of Calvinism, in advancing the cause of civil liberty, has been derived from its theology. The sense of the exaltation of the Almighty Ruler, and of his intimate connection with the minutest incidents and obligations of human life, which is fostered by this theology, dwarfs all earthly potentates. An intense spirituality, a consciousness that this life is but an infinitesimal fraction of human existence, dissipates the feeling of personal homage for men, however high their station, and dulls the luster of all earthly grandeur. Calvinism and Romanism are the antipodes of each other. Yet, it is curious to observe that the effect of these opposite systems upon the attitude of men towards the civil authority has often been not dissimilar. But the Calvinist, unlike the Romanist, dispenses with a human priesthood, which has not only often proved a powerful direct auxiliary to temporal rulers, but has educated the sentiments to a habit of subjection, which renders submission to such rulers more facile and less easy to shake off.

CHAPTER VIII

THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE

The long contest for Gallican rights had lowered the prestige of the popes in France, but it had not weakened the Catholic Church, which was older than the monarchy itself, and, in the feeling of the people, was indissolubly associated with it.[1] The College of the Sorbonne, or the Theological Faculty at Paris, and the Parliament, which had together maintained Gallican liberty, in a spirit of independence of the Papacy, were united in stern hostility to all doctrinal innovations. The Concordat concluded between Francis I. and Leo X., after the battle of Marignano, gave to the King the right of presentation to vacant benefices; to the Pope, the first-fruits. It excited profound discontent, and was only registered by Parliament after prolonged resistance and under a protest. It abolished the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438, which had been deemed the charter of Gallican independence. It put into the hands of Francis I., and a great many laymen besides, an endless amount of patronage of one sort and another, but it weakened the Catholic Church, only as it led to the introduction of incompetent, unworthy persons, favorites of the court, into ecclesiastical offices, and thus increased the necessity for reform.[2] In Southern France a remnant of the Waldenses had survived, and the recollection of the Catharists was still preserved in popular songs and legends. But the first movements towards reform emanated from the Humanist culture.

A literary and scientific spirit was awakened in France through the lively intercourse with Italy, which subsisted under Louis XII. and Francis I. By Francis especially, Italian scholars and artists were induced in large numbers to take up

[1] Ranke, *Französische Geschichte vornehmlich im* 16. *u.* 17. *Jahrhundert*, i. 110.

[2] On the corruption consequent upon the Concordat, see Ranke, *Französische Geschichte*, i. 131; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. i., p. 674.

their abode in France. Frenchmen likewise visited Italy and brought home the classical culture which they acquired there. Among the scholars who cultivated Greek was Budæus, the foremost of them, whom Erasmus styled the "wonder of France." After the "Peace of the Dames" was concluded at Cambray, in 1529, when Francis surrendered Italy to Charles V., a throng of patriotic Italians who feared or hated the Spanish rule, streamed over the Alps and gave a new impulse to literature and art. Poets, artists, and scholars found in the king a liberal and enthusiastic patron. The new studies, especially Hebrew and Greek, were opposed by all the might of the Sorbonne, the leader of which was the Syndic, Beda. He and his associates were on the watch for heresy, and every author who was suspected of overstepping the bounds of orthodoxy, was immediately accused and subjected to persecution. Thus two parties were formed, the one favorable to the new learning, and the other inimical to it and rigidly wedded to the traditional theology.[1]

The Father of the French Reformation, or the one more entitled to this distinction than any other, is Jacques Lefèvre, who was born at Étaples, a little village of Picardy, about the year 1455, prosecuted his studies at the University of Paris, and having become a master of arts and a priest, spent some time in Italy. After his return he taught mathematics and philosophy at Paris, was active in publishing and commenting on the works of Aristotle, which he had studied in the original in Italy, as well as in printing books of ancient mathematicians, writings of the Fathers, and mystical productions of the Middle Ages. Lefèvre was honored among the Humanists as the restorer of philosophy and science in the University. Deeply imbued with a religious spirit, in 1509 he put forth a commentary on the Psalms, and in 1512 a commentary on the Epistles of Paul. As early as about 1512, he said to his pupil Farel: "God will renovate the world, and you will be a witness of it;" and in the last-named work, he says that the signs of the times betoken that a renovation of the Church is near at hand. He teaches the doctrine of gratuitous justification, and deals with the Scriptures as the supreme and sufficient authority. But a mystical, rather than

[1] Weber, *Geschichtliche Darstellung d. Calvinismus im Verhältniss zum Staat*, p. 33 seq.

a polemical vein characterizes him; and while this prevented him from breaking with the Church, it also blunted the sharpness of the opposition which his opinions were adapted to produce. One of his pupils was Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux, who held the same view of justification with Lefèvre, and fostered the evangelical doctrine in his diocese. The enmity of the Sorbonne to Lefèvre and his school took a more aggressive form when the writings of Luther began to be read in the University and elsewhere. The theologians of the Sorbonne set their faces against every deviation from the dogmatic system of Aquinas. Reuchlin, having been a student at Paris, had hoped for support there in his conflict with the Dominicans of Cologne; but the Paris faculty declared against him. In 1521 they sat in judgment on Luther and condemned him as a heretic and blasphemer.[1] Heresy was treated by them as an offense against the State; and the Parliament, the highest judicial tribunal, showed itself prompt to carry out their decrees by the infliction of the usual penalties. The Sorbonne formally condemned a dissertation of Lefèvre on a point of the evangelical history, in which he had controverted the traditional opinion. He, with Farel, Gérard Roussel, and other preachers, found an asylum with Briçonnet. Lefèvre translated the New Testament from the Vulgate, and, in a commentary on the Gospels, explicitly pronounced the Bible the sole rule of faith, which the individual might interpret for himself, and declared justification to be through faith alone, without human works or merit. It seemed as if Meaux aspired to become another Wittenberg.[2] At length a commission of Parliament was appointed to take cognizance of heretics in that district. Briçonnet, either intimidated or recoiling at the sight of an actual secession from the Church, joined in the condemnation of Luther and of his opinions, and even acquiesced in the persecution which fell upon Protestantism within his diocese. Lefèvre fled to Strasburg, was afterwards recalled by Francis I., but ultimately took up his abode in the court of the King's sister, Margaret, the Queen of Navarre.[3] At about the time of his death (1536), Calvin's Institutes

[1] Melancthon replied. Seckendorf, i. 185.

[2] Henri Martin, *Histoire de France*, viii. 149.

[3] The middle path which Roussel and others, who accepted the doctrine of justification by faith, but remained in the Roman Catholic Church, endeavored to take, is exhibited by Schmidt in his work, *Gérard Roussel, prédicateur de la*

appeared, which gave to the Huguenots a definite creed and a unity which imparted to them strength, at the same time that it cost them a fraction of their adherents.

Margaret, from the first, was favorably inclined to the new doctrines. There were two parties at the court. The mother of the King, Louisa of Savoy, and the Chancellor Duprat, were allies of the Sorbonne. They were of the class of persons, numerous in that age, who endeavor to atone for private vices by bigotry, and by the persecution of heterodox opinions. Margaret, on the contrary, a versatile and accomplished princess, cherished a mystical devotion which carried her beyond Briçonnet in her acceptance of the teaching of the Reformers. But this very spirit of mysticism, or quietism, produced in her mind an indifference as to external rites and forms of ecclesiastical order; so that while she received the Protestant idea of salvation by faith, and of the direct personal communion of the soul with Christ, she was not moved to withdraw from the mass, or separate formally from the old Church. There was a warm friendliness for the reforming preachers, a disposition to protect them against their enemies, a type of piety that no longer relished the invocation of saints, and of the Virgin, and various other peculiarities of the Catholic Ritual, yet left the sacraments and the polity of the Church unassailed. The passionate attachment of Margaret to her brother, of which so much has been said, illustrates her nature, in which sensibility had so large a place.[1] The authoress of a religious poem, the "Mirror of the Sinful Soul," which was so Protestant in its tone as to excite the wrath of the Sorbonne, and of many devotional hymns; she also composed, when in middle life, the "Heptameron," a series of tales in the style of Boccaccio, in which the moral reflections and warnings are a weak antidote to the natural influence of the narratives themselves.[2] Before the death of her first husband,

Reine Marguerite de Navarre (1845), and in the articles, by the same author, in Herzog's *Realencycl.*, "Briçonnet," "Gérard Roussel," and "Margaretha von Orleans."

[1] See the judicious remarks of Henri Martin, viii. 83, n. 4. M. Genin, in his *Supplément à la notice sur Marguerite d'Angoulême*, which forms the preface to the *Nouvelles Lettres de la Reine de la Navarre*, has given an improbable version of this "triste mystère," which attributes a culpable intention to the sister. An opposite view is presented by Michelet, *La Réforme*, p. 175.

[2] See the brief but admirable remarks of Professor Morley, in his interesting biography of Clement Marot (London, 1871), i. 272. It is a curious illustration of the manners of the French nobility at this time, that Margaret should be the

the Duke of Alençon, and while she was a widow, she exerted her influence to the full extent in behalf of the persecuted Protestants, and in opposition to the Sorbonne. After her marriage to Henry d'Albret, the King of Navarre, she continued, in her own little court and principality, to favor the reformed doctrine, and its professors. Occasionally her peculiar temperament led her to entertain hospitably enthusiasts who concealed an antinomian license under a mystical theory of gospel liberty. Calvin wrote to her on the subject, in consequence of her complaint respecting the language of his book against this sect.[1] He somewhere speaks of her attachment, and that of her friends, to the Gospel, as a platonic love. Yet, the drift of her influence appears in the character of her daughter, the heroic Jeanne d'Albret, the mother of Henry IV., and in the readiness of the people, over whom Margaret immediately ruled, to receive the Protestant faith. Her marriage to the King of Navarre, and retirement from the French court were preceded by the return to England of one of the young ladies in her service, Anne Boleyn, whose tragical history is so intimately connected with the introduction of Protestantism into England.[2]

Francis I., whose generous patronage of artists and men of letters, gave him the title of "Father of Science," had no love for the Sorbonne, for the Parliament, or for the monks. He entertained the plan of bringing Erasmus to Paris, and placing him at the head of an institution of learning. He read the Bible with his mother and sister, and felt no superstitious aversion to the leaders of reform. He established the college of "the three languages," in defiance of the Sorbonne. The Faculty of Theology, and the Parliament, found in the King and court a hindrance to their persecuting policy. It was in the face of his opposition that the Sorbonne put the treatise of Lefèvre on their list of prohibited books. It was not through any agency of the King that the company of reforming preachers in Meaux was

writer of these stories, and that her daughter, the virtuous and noble Jeanne d'Albret, should have published them in the first correct edition. See Merle d'Aubigné, *History of the Reformation in the Time of Calvin*, ii. 170.

[1] The treatise, *Contre la Secte Fantastique et Furieuse des Libertines qui se disent Spirituels* (1544). Calvin's Letter is in Bonnet, i. 429.

[2] The Letters of Margaret have been published by M. Génin, *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême* (1841); *Nouvelles Lettres de la Reine de Navarre* (1842). To the first of these collections is prefixed a full biographical introduction. Her character and career are described by Von Polenz, *Gsch. d. Französische Prot.*, i. 199 seq.

dispersed. The revolt of the Constable Bourbon made it necessary for Francis to conciliate the clergy; and the battle of Pavia, followed by the captivity of the King, and the regency of his mother, gave a free rein to the persecutors. An inquisitorial court, composed partly of laymen, was ordained by Parliament. Heretics were burned at Paris, and in the provinces. Louis de Berquin, who combined a culture which won the admiration of Erasmus, with the religious earnestness of Luther, was thrown into prison. The King, however, on his return from Spain, at the earnest intercession of Margaret, set him free. The failure of Francis, in his renewed struggle in Italy, emboldened the persecuting party. Berquin, who had commenced a prosecution against Beda, the leader of the heresy-hunting commissioners appointed by the Sorbonne, was again taken into custody, and this time was burnt before the King could interpose to save him. The theological antagonists of Reform went so far as to endeavor to put restrictions upon the professors in the college for the ancient languages, and even to lampoon, in a scholastic comedy, the King's sister, against whom they threw out charges of heresy, besides condemning her book, the "Mirror of the Sinful Soul." Francis was, at this time, holding a conference with Clement VII., in Provence, and on his return was extremely indignant at the treatment of his sister. He authorized Gérard Roussel to preach freely in Paris; and when Beda raised an outcry against his sermons, Francis caused Beda to be banished and prosecuted for sedition. He died in prison, in 1537.

At this moment it seemed doubtful what course France would take in the great religious conflict of the period. In 1534, Henry VIII. separated England from the Papacy, and made himself the head of the English Church. This event made a profound impression throughout Christendom. Since the Diet of Worms, the Papacy had lost the half of Germany and of Switzerland, then Denmark (in 1526), then Sweden (in 1527), and now England. The Netherlands were deeply agitated, and the conflagration which Luther had kindled was spreading into Italy and Spain. The Teutonic portion of Christendom was lost to Rome; what would be the decision of the Romanic nations? It was inevitable that all eyes should be turned to France, and to its King.[1] Early in 1534, the Landgrave of Hesse came to negotiate

[1] Henri Martin, viii. 180.

in person with Francis. Margaret corresponded with Melancthon, whom she was desirous of bringing to France. The Landgrave restored the Duke of Würtemberg to his possessions, and in Würtemberg the two forms of worship, Lutheran and Catholic, were made free. Francis I. had approached nearer to the Protestants; and the death of Clement VII., in September of this year (1534), had released Francis from his political ties with the Medici and the Papacy. The violent spirit of the champions of the Papacy in Paris, the offensive proceedings of monks in Orleans and elsewhere, had produced a reaction unfavorable to their cause.

An eminent modern historian of France has depicted the three rival systems, Rome, the Renaissance, and the Reformation, which were presented to the choice of France, and were represented in three individuals, who happened to be together for a moment in Paris — Calvin, Rabelais, Loyola.[1] This interesting passage of Martin suggests a few observations which, however, are not wholly in accord with his own. Calvinism was a product of the French mind. In its sharp and logical structure it corresponded to the peculiarities of the French intellect. In its moral earnestness, in its demand for the reform of ecclesiastical abuses, it found a response in the consciences of good men. But Calvinism was the radical type of Protestantism; it broke abruptly and absolutely with the past, and must for this reason encounter a vast might of opposition from traditional feelings, from sacred or superstitious associations. The dogma of predestination, which Calvinism put in the forefront of its theology, would stir up the hostility of men in whom the spirit of the Renaissance was predominant, not to speak of other classes. It was, moreover, a defect that Calvinism did not rise to the level of religious toleration. In the midst of their own sufferings, the Calvinistic preachers of France invoked the arm of the magistrate to suppress and punish Anabaptists, Servetians, and the like, not as disturbers of civil order, but as heretics. But stronger than any other obstacle in the way of the Calvinistic Reform was the amendment of life which it required. It was too stern, unrelenting a foe of sensuality to make itself tolerable to a multitude of men and women, in the court and out of it, who could have endured easily its doctrinal for-

[1] Ibid., 184.

mulas and have submitted to its method of worship. At the opposite extreme from Calvinism was the spirit of Spanish Catholicism, the reawakened zeal for the traditions, the authority, the imaginative worship of the old religion; the spirit of the Catholic Reaction, which found an embodiment in Loyola and his famous society. With this spirit, France as a nation, France left to its natural impulses and affinities, did not sympathize. Between these mighty contending forces, which more and more were coming into conflict, was the literary, philosophical, skeptical temper of the Renaissance, which found an expression in that strangest of writers, Rabelais, whose extraordinary genius has been acknowledged by the profoundest students of literature, whose influence upon the French language has been compared to that of Dante upon the Italian, and who veiled under a mask of burlesque fiction — of filth and ribaldry, too, we must add — his ideas upon human nature, society, education, and religion. The follies of monks and priests, the sophistry and ferocity of the Sorbonne, he lashes to such an extent that he needed powerful protectors to save him from their wrath. His own religion does not extend beyond a theism, in which even personal immortality has no clear recognition. It is doubtless true that one type of thought and feeling in France at that day is reflected on the pages of Gargantua and Pantagruel. A little later, a skepticism of a somewhat modified type, yet a genuine product, likewise, of the Renaissance, appears in Montaigne. Whatever attractions this species of philosophical skepticism, or of natural religion, may have for the French mind, it was too intangible in form, it had too little of earnestness and courage, to mediate between the two resolute combatants who were to contend for the possession of France. Much, if not everything, depended on the path which the hesitating monarch, Francis I., would conclude to take. The French monarchy, it has been said, which had been emancipated politically from Rome since Philip the Fair, had nothing to gain by becoming Protestant.[1] But at least it had much to gain by preserving its independence; by refusing to enlist in the reactionary, repressive policy of Spanish Catholicism; by declining to partake in a work in which the House of Austria had taken the leading part. But Francis I. did not assume a distinct and independent posi-

[1] Mignet, quoted by Henri Martin, viii. 216.

tion. He did not embrace Protestantism; he did not consistently throw himself upon the side of ultramontane Catholicism. Now partially tolerating the Reformation, and now persecuting it with base cruelty, he adhered to no definite policy. By this undecided and vacillating attitude he brought upon his country incalculable miseries, civil wars in which France became "not the arbiter, but the prey, of Europe," and its soil "the frightful theater of the battle of sects and nations." "His dynasty perished in blood and mire," and France would have perished with it, had not this fate been arrested by a statesman and warrior whom Providence raised up to mitigate the lot of his country.[1]

Notwithstanding his friendly professions to the Lutherans, it soon appeared that if Francis would have been glad to see a Reformation after the Erasmian type, he had no sympathy with attacks upon the doctrine of the Sacraments or upon the hierarchical system of the Church, the topics which his sister, in her writings, had avoided. Nor had he any disposition to countenance movements that involved a religious division in his kingdom. As long as religious dissent was confined to men of rank and education, the King might discountenance the use of force to repress it; but when it penetrated into the lower ranks of the people, the case was different. Unity in religion was an element in the strength of his monarchy, of which he boasted. He prized the old maxim, "Un roi, un foi, un loi." When, therefore, in October, 1534, inconsiderate zealots posted at the corners of the streets in Paris, and even on the door of the King's chamber at Blois, placards denouncing the mass, he signalized his devotion to the Catholic religion by coming to Paris to take part in solemn religious processions, and in the burning, with circumstances of atrocious cruelty, of eighteen heretics. Yet again he showed himself anxious to cement a political alliance with the German Protestants, and even entered into negotiations looking to a union of the opposing religious parties. He went so far as to invite Melancthon to Paris to help forward the enterprise. He claimed that the persons who had been put to death were fanatics and seditious people, whom the safety of the State rendered it necessary to destroy. In truth, the Grand Master, Montmorenci, and the Cardinal de Tournon, active promoters of persecution, had persuaded him that the posting of the placards was

[1] Martin, p. 217.

the first step in a great plot of Anabaptists, who designed to do in France what they had done in Münster.[1] But the unwillingness of Francis to produce a schism, or to place himself in antagonism to the Catholic Church obliged him (1543) to give his approval to a rigid statement of doctrine, in opposition to the Protestant views, which the Sorbonne put forth, in the form of a direction to preachers.[2] It was their answer (in twenty-six Articles) to the Institutes of Calvin, published in a French translation. This approval by the King followed (in 1543) the issue by him of several severe edicts, one of them the ordinance for a sharper process in the trial of heretics (1540). Parliament, as a part of its edict (1542) for the control of the press, ordained that all copies of the Institutes should be surrendered without delay. After an interval, they were burnt in a solemn style, and the first *Index Expurgatorius* by Parliament was issued soon after. He even did not lift a finger, in 1545, to prevent the wholesale slaughter of his unoffending Waldensian subjects. His governing aim was to uphold the power of France, and to withstand and reduce the power of the Emperor. Hence he cultivated the friendship and assisted the cause of the Protestants in Germany, while he was inflicting imprisonment and death upon their brethren in France. It was not partiality for Protestantism, but hostility to Charles, that moved him; and so strong was this sentiment, that he did not hesitate to make common cause with the Turks, for the sake of weakening his adversary. On the whole, during the reign of Francis, Protestant opinions found not a little favor among the higher classes. For a while, it was Lutheranism that was adopted. But Luther was too thoroughly a German to be congenial to the French mind. It was Calvinism, as soon as Calvinism arose, which attracted the sympathies of the Frenchmen who accepted the Protestant faith.

After the mischievous affair of the placards, the closing years of the reign of Francis — he died in 1547 — were a period of cruel persecution, when Calvinists were driven into exile, and a large number suffered cruel torture and death. The courage and quickened zeal of the victims inspired a great number with sympathy with their faith, and seemed to plant Calvinism in a number of the French Universities, and in nearly all the provinces. New Protestant churches were founded.

[1] Henri Martin, viii. 223. [2] Ranke, i. 116.

Farel and Calvin were both fugitives from persecution in France. Calvin returned to Geneva from his banishment in 1541. More and more Geneva became an asylum for Frenchmen whom intolerance drove from their country. Many of them came, wearing the scars which the instruments of torture had left upon them. As the victims of religious cruelty emerged from the passes of the Jura and caught sight of the holy city, they fell on their knees with thanksgivings to God.[1] From thirty printing-offices of Geneva, Protestant works were sent forth, which were scattered over France by colporteurs at the peril of their lives. The Bible in French was issued in a little volume, which it was easy to hide; also the Psalms, in the version of Clement Marot, with the interlinear music of Goudimel.[2] Calvin was indefatigable in exhorting and encouraging his countrymen by his letters. Preachers who were trained at his side returned to their country and ministered to the little churches which long held their worship in secret. The Reformation spread rapidly, especially in the south of France. The spectacle of godly men of pure lives, led to the stake, while atheists and scoffers were tolerated if they would go to the mass, alienated many from the old religion.

Henry II., who succeeded his father in 1547, had no sympathy with Protestantism. He might support the Protestants abroad when a political object was to be gained, as when he entered into a treaty with Maurice at the time when the latter was about to take up arms against the Emperor; but at home he coöperated with the Sorbonne, who were more and more busy in their work of extirpating false doctrine by burning the books and persons of its professors. The rage of the common people, and even the holy horror of licentious courtiers, were excited by fictitious tales of abominable vice which was said to be practiced in the meetings of the Huguenots. To be objects of this sort of calumny has been a common experience of sects which have been obliged to conduct their rites in secrecy.[3]

Yet in this reign the Protestant opinions made great prog-

[1] Sismondi, *Histoire des Français*, xiii. 24 seq.

[2] See an eloquent passage on the influence of Geneva, in Michelet, *Guerres de Religion*, p. 108.

[3] Such accusations were brought against Jews in the Middle Ages. Like charges were brought against the early Christians in the Roman Empire. Gibbon, II. ch. xv.

ress. In 1558 it was estimated that there were two thousand places of reformed worship scattered over France, and congregations numbering four hundred thousand. They were organized after the Presbyterian form, and were adherents of the Genevan type of doctrine. In 1559 they ventured to hold a general synod in Paris, where they adopted their confession of faith and determined the method of their church organization.

After Henry concluded the disastrous peace of Cateau-Cambresis, by which his conquests in Italy and in the Netherlands were given up to Spain, and his daughter, Elizabeth, was to be married to Philip II., and his sister, Margaret, to the Duke of Savoy, he commenced with fresh vigor the work of persecution. It was involved in this treaty that the two kings should unite in the suppression of heresy. "The King of France, which, since the reverses of Charles V., had been the first power in Europe, bought, at the price of many provinces, the rank of Lieutenant of the King of Spain in the Catholic party." [1] He unexpectedly presented himself in a session of Parliament, where a milder policy had begun to find advocates, and ordered the two members who had expressed themselves most emphatically on that side to be shut up in the Bastile. He declared that he would make the extirpation of heresy his principal business, and by letter threatened the Parliament and inferior courts in case they showed any leniency to heretics. But in a tilt which formed a part of the festivals in honor of the marriages, a splinter from the spear of Montgomery, the Captain of his Guards, struck his eye and inflicted a deadly wound. It seemed to the Protestants that in the moment of extreme peril the hand of the Almighty was stretched out to deliver them (1559).

Thus far persecution had failed of its design. "The fanatics and the politicians had thought to annihilate heresy by the number and atrocity of the punishments: they perceived with dismay that the hydra multiplied itself under their blows. They had only succeeded in exalting to a degree unheard of before, all that there are of heroic powers in the human soul. For one martyr who disappeared in the flames, there presented themselves a hundred more: men, women, children, marched to

[1] Martin, viii. 480.

their punishment, singing the Psalms of Marot, or the Canticle of Simeon —

> Rappelez votre Serviteur,
> Seigneur! j'ai vu votre Sauveur.

Many expired in ecstasy, insensible to the refined cruelties of the savages who invented tortures to prolong their agony. More than one judge died of consternation or remorse. Others embraced the faith of those whom they sent to the scaffold. The executioner at Dijon was converted at the foot of the pyre. All the great phenomena, in the most vast proportions, of the first days of Christianity, were seen to reappear. Most of the victims died with the eye turned towards that New Jerusalem, that holy city of the Alps, where some had been to seek, whence others had received the Word of God. Not a preacher, not a missionary was condemned who did not salute Calvin from afar, thanking him for having prepared him for so beautiful an end. They no more thought of reproaching Calvin for not following them into France than a soldier reproaches his general for not plunging into the mêlée." [1]

We have now to refer to the circumstances that converted the Huguenots into a political party. With the accession of Francis II., a boy of sixteen, Catharine de Medici, the widow of the late king and the mother of his successor, hoped to gratify her ambition by ruling the kingdom. The daughter of Lorenzo II., of Florence, and the niece of Clement VII., her childhood had been passed in an atmosphere of duplicity, and she had thoroughly imbibed the unprincipled maxims of the Italian school of politics. The death of the Dauphin had made her husband the heir of the throne; but his aversion to her was such that, at an earlier day, when it was supposed that no children would spring from her marriage, there was an idea of sending her back to Italy. She had to pay assiduous court to the mistresses of her father-in-law and her husband. Even after the birth of her children and after her husband ascended the throne, she did not escape from her humiliating position. She was dependent upon the good offices of Diana of Poitiers, Henry's mistress, for the maintenance of relations with her husband, whose repugnance to her was partly founded on physical peculiarities, which were derived from her profligate father and which entailed a diseased constitution upon her

[1] Martin, viii. 480.

children.[1] Accustomed from early childhood to hide her thoughts and feelings; without conscience and almost without a heart; caring little for religion except to hate its restraints, Catharine had nursed her dream of ambition in secret.[2] But the fact that Francis was legally of age, though practically in his minority, disappointed her hope. It immediately appeared that the young King was entirely under the control of the family of Guise. Claude of Guise had been a wealthy and prominent nobleman of Lorraine, who had distinguished himself at Marignano, and in the subsequent contests with Charles V. Two of his sons, Francis, Duke of Guise, and Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, had acquired great power under Henry II.: the Duke as a military leader, especially by the successful defense of Metz and the taking of Calais; and the Cardinal as Confessor of the King, whose conscience, Beza says, he carried in his sleeve. Both were unpopular, the Cardinal, from his hostility to heresy, specially odious to the Protestants. Their sister had married James V., of Scotland; and her daughter, Mary Stuart, who was to play so prominent a part in the history of the age, was wedded to the youthful King, Francis II. He was weak in mind and body, and it was not difficult for the Cardinal and the Duke, both of them aspiring and adroit men, with the aid of the vigorous and beautiful young Queen, to maintain a complete ascendency over him. The Cardinal was supreme in the affairs of State, the Duke in the military department. It was an association of the soldier and the diplomatist, the lion and the fox, for their common aggrandizement. The Guises set themselves up as the champions of the old religion, although they at first adopted the policy of withstanding Charles V. through an alliance with the Pope. They had large hopes of acquiring power in Italy, and assumed to inherit the claim of the house of Anjou to Naples. On the accession of Francis their first step was to induce the King to give a courteous dismissal to the Grand Constable, Montmorenci, who, with his numerous relatives, had been the rivals of the Guises and had shared with them the offices and honors of the king-

[1] Michelet, *Guerres de Religion*, p. 43.

[2] Anquetil strives to paint Catharine, in some points, in a less unfavorable light. *L'Esprit de la Ligue*, i. 54. She is characterized by the Duc d'Aumale as being "without affections, without principles, and without scruples." *History of the Princes of Condé*, i. 86.

dom. It was by the support of Diana of Poitiers, one of whose daughters had married their brother, that the Guises were enabled first to make themselves the equals and then the superiors of Montmorenci, whom they greatly outstripped in political sagacity.[1]

It was not to be expected that the great nobles of France would quietly see the control of the government practically usurped by persons whom they considered upstarts, who had seized on places that did not belong to them by the laws and customs of the realm. The opposition to the Guises centered in two families, the houses of Bourbon and Chatillon. The three brothers of the former house were princes of the blood, being descended by a collateral line from Louis IX. Anthony of Vendome, the eldest, who by his marriage with Jeanne d'Albret, the daughter of Margaret, wore the title of King of Navarre, had been moved to take the side of the Protestants, but was a man of weak and vacillating character. He had no loftier hope than to get back from Spain his principality of Navarre, or to provide himself with an equivalent dominion elsewhere. The second brother, Charles, the Cardinal of Rouen, was of a similar temperament. The third, Louis, Prince of Condé, was a brave man, not without noble qualities, but rash in counsel, and not proof against the enticements of sensual pleasure. The Protestant wives of these men, the Queen of Navarre and the Princess of Condé, a niece of the Constable, had more firmness of religious conviction than their husbands. The three brothers of the house of Chatillon, sons of Louisa of Montmorenci, the sister of the Constable, were men of a nobler make. These were Odet, Cardinal of Chatillon, Admiral Coligny, and Dandelot, Colonel of the Cisalpine infantry. Coligny had acquired great credit by introducing strict discipline into the French infantry, and by valor at St. Quentin and elsewhere. In all the qualities of mind and character that constitute human greatness, he was without a peer. His attachment to the Protestant cause was sincere and immovable.

That the Bourbons and the great nobles who were connected with them should seek the support of the persecuted Calvinists, and that the latter, in turn, should seek for deliverance through them was natural.[2] The Guises were virtual usurpers, who had taken the station that belonged to the princes of the blood,

[1] Henri Martin, viii. 362. [2] Ranke, i. 154.

and, at the same time, were persecutors. The nobles, their antagonists, and their Protestant co-religionists had a common cause. There was a union of political and religious motives to bind them all together. If political considerations had a governing weight with Anthony of Navarre and some other leaders, this was the misfortune, and a heavy misfortune it proved, of the Huguenots; but it was not their fault. While it is vain to ignore the influence of political aspirations, it is a greater error of some writers, like Davila, to ascribe the whole movement of the Huguenot leaders to motives of this character.[1] There was on their part a thorough opposition to the cruel persecution of the Calvinists, and an attachment to their cause, which, if it was inconstant in some cases, proved in others a profound and growing conviction, such as no terrors and no sacrifices could weaken.

Calvin, like the Lutheran reformers, preached the doctrine of obedience to rulers, and uncomplaining submission to suffering and death.[2] For forty years the unoffending Huguenots had acted on this principle and submitted to indescribable indignities and cruelties, inflicted often by men who in their own daily lives violated every commandment of the decalogue. But even Calvin held that Christians might lawfully take up arms, under authorized leaders, to overthrow usurpation. We shall see, moreover, that it was the unchecked atrocities, not of the magistrates, but of their subjects, acting without color of law, that kindled the flames of civil war. But in France, as in Germany, during this period, the reluctance of the Protestants to abandon the ground of passive resistance and to rise against their oppressors, the indecision of the Protestants on this question, more than once cost them dear.

[1] Davila (*Storia delle Guerre Civili di Francia*) describes a formal meeting in Vendome, at which Condé and others advocated an open war, but Coligny persuaded them to adopt a more crafty policy. Davila makes the conspiracy of Amboise the result of this conference. But it is not credible that such a conference was ever held. See the searching criticism of Davila by Ranke, *Franz. Geschichte*, v. 3 seq.

[2] See Henry, iii. 548, and Beil., p. 154 seq. Speaking of the counsel which he gave in reference to the Amboise conspiracy, Calvin says: "Cependant les lamentations estoyent grandes de l'inhumanité quon exerçoit pour abolir la religion: mesme d'heure en heure on attendoit une horrible boucherie, pour exterminer tous les povres fideles." He says, that he replied, that if a single drop of blood were shed, rivers of blood would flow over Europe; moreover that it is better "for us all to perish a hundred times, than that the name of the adherents of the Gospel should be exposed to such opprobrium."

The conspiracy of Amboise was a plot, of which a French gentleman, La Renaudie, was the most active contriver, to dispossess the Guises of their position by force and to place the control of the government in the hands of the princes of the blood. Condé appears to have been privy to it. Coligny refused to take part in it; Calvin tried to dissuade La Renaudie from executing his project, which the Reformer sternly disapproved, unless the princes of the blood, not Condé alone, but the first of them in rank, were to sanction it, and Parliament were to join with them.[1] The Guises were forewarned and forearmed, and took a savage revenge, not only upon the conspirators, but upon a great number of innocent Protestants, whom the conspirators had invited to the court to present their petitions, but who had no further complicity in the undertaking (1560).

The commotion of which this abortive scheme was an impressive sign, had the effect to moderate for the moment the policy of the Cardinal. The prisons were opened and the Protestants set at liberty. The Edict of Romorantin, in 1560, passed by the agency of L'Hospital, no friend of the Guises, still forbade all Protestant assemblies for worship, but proceedings against individuals on account of their faith were to be dropped. The tares, it was said, had become too strong to be eradicated from the field. The Protestants made an appeal for liberty to meet together for worship. Their petition was boldly presented to the King in an Assembly of Notables at Fontainebleau by Coligny, who had espoused, but not yet publicly professed, the new opinions. At the same time, a demand was made for a meeting of the States General, to consider the

[1] See Calvin's letter, cited above, on the subject (April 16, 1561), in Henry, iii. 21; Beil., p. 153. There can be no doubt that La Renaudie represented Condé to be the silent leader of the enterprise. That he was is generally assumed, and probably with truth. Henri Martin, viii. 34 seq. Sismondi, *Histoire des Français*, xviii. 132. Duc d'Aumale, *History of the Princes of Condé*, i. 56. It is so stated by Beza, *Histoire des Eglises Réf.*, i. 250. Ranke says: "Mit historischer Bestimmtheit lasst sich selbst nicht sagen ob La Renaudie sich mit Condé verabredet hatte." (i. 147.) Ranke adverts to the denial of Condé; but he only denied that he had been a party in any enterprise *against the King or the State*. He would not have admitted that the Conspiracy of Amboise was directed against either. See Mrs. Marsh's interesting work, *The Prot. Ref. in France* (London, 1847), i. 142, n. Brantôme, who rises to something like enthusiasm in praising the virtues of Coligny, says that the conspirators were prevented by his known probity and sense of honor from imparting to him their secret. *Les Hommes Illustres*, l. III. xx. (M. l'Admiral de Chastillon). Brantôme compares Coligny and Guise, as lapidaries (he says) place together two diamonds of exquisite beauty.

finances of the kingdom, and for a National Council to regulate the affairs of religion. The Cardinal was obliged to acquiesce. The Guises now exerted all their influence to combine an overwhelming party against the Protestants and the Bourbon princes. Calvin adhered to his principle and discountenanced all violence on the side of the Protestants, who were inclined to take possession of churches; but he sought to persuade the princes to collect the nobles of Provence, Languedoc, and Normandy, and make such a demonstration as would of itself, without bloodshed, break down the power of their antagonists. The frivolous Anthony of Navarre was not equal to so manly an undertaking. Summoned by the court to Orleans, he went with Condé. They went, aware of the peril in which they placed themselves, and in opposition to the advice of their friends and the entreaties of their wives. Condé was put under arrest, on the charge of complicity in the Amboise Conspiracy. The King of Navarre was deprived of his officers and guards, and surrounded with soldiers and spies. The Deputies of the Estates, as they arrived, found everything in the hands of the Cardinal; and were compelled, at the outset, to sign a Catholic creed. The same test was to be presented to the chevaliers of the Order of St. Michael, the French cardinals, the prelates, the nobles, and the royal officers present at Orleans. The laymen who should refuse to sign this formulary were to be deprived of all their offices and estates, and the next day sent to the stake. Ecclesiastics were to be remanded to their own order for trial and judgment. It was expected that Coligny and Dandelot, and probably their brother, the Cardinal, would be involved in this destruction of the Protestant leaders. The same creed was to be imposed on all officials and pastors throughout the kingdom, and the requirement was to be enforced by bodies of soldiers, who were to march through the land. The dominion of the Catholic Church was to be at once established. The Guises pushed forward, with all possible rapidity, the process against Condé, who was charged with high treason.[1] He was condemned, and the 10th of Decem-

[1] That the existence of this plot was credited by the Huguenot leaders admits of no doubt. For the evidence of its reality, which appears to be sufficient, see Henri Martin, ix. 54, n. Ranke says: "Ich habe manches gefunden, wodurch diese Behauptungen" — the reports of the conspiracy — "bestätigt, nichts wodurch sie ganz ausser Zweifel gesetzt würden." i. 156. Martin says: "The

ber was the day fixed for his execution. Just then, on the 5th of December, 1560, the young King suddenly died. Once more the Protestants felt that an interposition of Providence had saved them. "When all was lost," said Beza, "behold the Lord our God awoke!"

The opportunity of the Queen Mother had come at last. The question whether her *second* son, Charles IX., was in his minority, could not be doubtful. She assumed the practical guardianship of him, and with it a virtual regency. The plan of the Guises to crush the house of Bourbon, and their supporters, by a single blow, had failed. L'Hospital easily convinced the Queen that it was for her interest to liberate Condé, and to put a check upon the power of the opposite party, which had barely failed of attaining to absolute control. The Duke was too wise to attempt to retain the supremacy, which the Cardinal, his brother, was not disposed to relinquish. The King of Navarre became Lieutenant-general. The Constable Montmorenci recovered the direction of military affairs, but the Guises kept their places in the Council, and Duke Francis retained the post of master of the royal household. But the favorable attitude of the government as regards toleration reënforced the Protestants. The Huguenots, as they came to be called,[1] were powerful in numbers, and still more in the character of their party. Entire counties were almost wholly Protestant. They were strong among the nobles and educated class. Many rich merchants adhered to them. But their largest support was from

authenticity of the plot, as to its substance, is not doubtful. The Guises sent as far as Turkey to induce the Sultan not to hinder, by any diversion against the Austrian States, the work of the destruction of heretics. The interminable discussions as to the premeditation of *St. Bartholomew*, interesting from a historical point of view, are extremely vain from the moral point of view. The *St. Bartholomew* — that is to say, the extermination of the heretics by force, open or with the aid of stratagem — had always been in the heart of the chiefs of the persecuting party. They massacred when they could, just as they burned."

[1] Beza explains the origin of the name Huguenots (i. 269). At Tours there was a superstitious belief that the ghost of Hugh Capet roamed through the city at night. As the Protestants held their meetings in the night, they were derisively called Huguenots, as if they were the troop of King Hugh. This explanation is given by De Thou, lxxiv. 741. Other writers, among them Merle d'Aubigné (i. 88), derive it from *Eidgenots*, the name given to the party of freedom at Geneva, who were for an alliance with the Swiss. Martin (viii. 28) unites both explanations. Littré (*Dict. Française*) adopts neither, but connects the term with the name of a person. A derivation from the *langue d'oc* of southern France has been recently suggested, the word "duganau" indicating "owl-like," probably with reference to night meetings. See *Bulletin hist. et litt.*, for 1898, p. 659 seq. The name seems to have been in use by 1552.

the intelligent middle classes, the artisans in the cities; although not a few of the lower orders, who had seen the world, and were practiced in bearing arms, were in the Huguenot ranks. In a representation made to the Pope, in 1561, by the middle party of French prelates, it was stated that a quarter of the entire population of the kingdom were Protestants. That it would be impracticable to exterminate them, and that both parties should make up their minds to live together in peace, was the conviction of a few dispassionate and far-sighted men, among whom was the Chancellor L'Hospital, who had been called to his office after the Conspiracy of Amboise, and who put forth his best exertions to recommend this wise and humane policy. His tolerant views were reflected in edicts of the States General at Orleans, where, also, sound reforms were adopted in the administration of justice; but these measures were resisted by Parliament, and by the Catholics attached to the Guises. The Duke of Guise was joined by Montmorenci; and they, with the Marshal of Saint André, formed the Triumvirate with which the feeble King of Navarre was unequally matched. Strife arose in the Council between the two parties. It was arranged, much to the joy of the Protestants, that a great religious conference should be held at Poissy to see if the two parties could come to an agreement. In this measure the Cardinal of Lorraine concurred, in the expectation that he should be able to bring out the differences between the Calvinists and the Lutherans, and deprive the former of their natural allies in the event of a religious war, which he probably anticipated. The elections from the nobility and the third estate for the States General, which first assembled, in 1561, at Pontoise, and afterwards adjourned to Poissy, were extremely unfavorable to the Guise faction. This meeting was really a crisis in the history of France.[1] The noblesse and the commonalty were united against the clergy, and presented measures of constitutional reform of a startling character, such, had they been carried through, as would have brought the French system of government into a striking resemblance to that of England, would have carried the nation along in one path, and prevented the civil wars. The Pope, the clergy, and the King of Spain united in efforts to stem the prevailing current towards compromise

[1] Ranke, i. 164, 165. Henri Martin, ix. 93.

or peace between the opposing confessions. But the religious colloquy was held. It was in the autumn of 1561. In the great Refectory of the Benedictines at Poissy, the young King sat in the midst of the aristocracy of France — Catharine de Medici, the King of Navarre, and the Prince of Condé, the great lords and ladies of the court, cardinals, bishops, and abbots, doctors of the Sorbonne, and a numerous company of lesser nobles, with their wives and daughters. In this brilliant concourse, Theodore Beza appeared at the head of the preachers and elders deputed by the Huguenots to represent their cause, and eloquently set forth the doctrines of the party of reform. Beza was a man of high birth, of prepossessing appearance, of graceful and polished manners, who was at his ease in the society of the court, and, prior to the public conference, won the respect and favor of many of his auditors by his attractiveness in social intercourse.[1] It was something gained for Protestantism, when such a man, with whom there could be no reluctance to associate on equal terms, was seen to come forward in its defense. But Beza, besides being an impressive speaker, was an erudite scholar, with his learning so perfectly at command that he could not be perplexed by his adversaries. At one time there was some prospect of an agreement, even in a general definition of the Eucharist. The final result of the interviews, public and private, that took place in connection with the conference, was to convince both parties that no compromise on the points of theological difference was practicable. Widespread disturbances in France, for one thing, moved Catharine to call together a new Conference at St. Germain (January, 1562). There the Chancellor frankly and boldly set forth the principles of religious toleration.

On the 17th of January, 1562, was issued the important Edict of St. Germain. It gave up the policy, which had been pursued for forty years, of extirpating religious dissent. It granted a measure of toleration. The Protestants were to surrender churches of which they had taken possession and were to build no more. On the other hand, they might, until further order should be taken, hold their religious meetings outside of the walls of cities, by daylight, without arms in their hands;

[1] See H. M. Baird, *Theodore Beza* (1899), p. 139 seq., for a full account of the Colloquy.

and their meetings were to be protected by the police. They were to pay regard to the festival days of the Catholic Church, were to assemble no consistories or synods without permission, were not to enter into any military organization or levy taxes upon one another, and were to teach according to the Scriptures, without insulting the mass and other Catholic institutions. It was a restricted toleration, but the practice had been to give to edicts of this nature some latitude of construction. Calvin rejoiced in it, and the Calvinists felt that under it they could convert the nation to the Protestant faith. Not until the 6th of March could the vote be carried in Parliament to register the Edict, and it was not long observed. The papal legate and the Catholic chiefs succeeded in inducing the King of Navarre to abandon the Protestant cause. He was told that the Pope would annul his marriage, and that he could then wed Mary, the young Queen of Scotland. He was not base enough to countenance this proposal.[1] The throne of Sardinia was held out to him as a compensation for the loss of Navarre. The only hope for the success of the tolerant policy of L'Hospital had rested in the union of the Queen Mother with the princes of the blood; and this union was now broken.

The leaders of the Catholic party were resolved not to acquiesce in a policy of toleration, not to give up the idea of obtaining uniformity by coercion. The massacre of Vassy was the event that occasioned war. On Sunday morning, the 1st of March, 1562, the Duke of Guise arrived at the village of Vassy on his way to Paris, at the head of a retinue of several hundred nobles and soldiers. The Protestants were holding their religious service in a spacious barn. Thither he sent some of his men, who provoked a conflict. The rest of the troop came to the spot, tore off the door, and with guns and sabers slaughtered and wounded a large number of the unarmed, defenseless congregation, and plundered their houses. Guise looked on and did not hinder the work. In fact, he had come to town with the design of putting an end to the Huguenot worship there.[2] Their preacher, bleeding from his wounds, he carried off as a prisoner. The Duke was received, especially in Paris, with acclamations. The Protestants throughout France justly considered his deed a wanton and atrocious violation of the

[1] Duc d'Aumale, i. 88. [2] Henri Martin, ix. 113.

Religious Peace, and flew to arms. In every parish a crusade was preached against the Huguenots, and the scenes of cruelty that followed have been styled, by a French historian, the St. Bartholomew of 1562. The Triumvirs seized the persons of the Queen Mother and the King, and, either with or without their consent, conveyed them to Paris, where the whole population were full of hatred to the heretics. Another massacre at Sens, even more cruel than that of Vassy, was the signal for an outburst of iconoclastic fury on the side of the Huguenots, which was attended with a great destruction of monuments of art and the profanation of sepulchers. It was true of the Huguenots that, "less barbarous, in general, than their adversaries, toward men, their rage was implacable against things" — against whatever they considered objects or signs of idolatry.[1]

Thus began the series of terrible wars, which only terminated with the accession of Henry IV. to the throne. In the devastation which they caused they may be compared to the Thirty Years' War in Germany. France was a prey to religious and political fanaticism. The passions that are always kindled in civil wars were made the more fierce from the religious consecration which was imparted to them. Other nations, as was inevitable, mingled in the frightful contest, and France had well-nigh lost its independence. It must be admitted that the Huguenots acted in self-defense. As we have said, their connection with a political party, whatever evils were incidental to it, was the unavoidable result of the course taken by their antagonists, who attacked at once the Protestant religion and the rights of the princes who professed it. But it was private violence countenanced by the authorities, against which the Huguenots rose in arms. Agrippa d'Aubigné, the Huguenot historian of the sixteenth century, says: "It is to be forever observed, that as long as they put the reformed to death under the forms of justice, however iniquitous and cruel it was, they stretched out their necks, but not their hands; but when the public authority, the magistrates, weary of their burnings, threw the knife into the hands of the crowd, and by tumults and great massacres took away the venerable face of justice, and caused neighbor to be slain by neighbor to the sound of trumpets and

[1] Henri Martin, ix. 124. On these wars see A. J. Butler, in *Cambridge Modern History*, iii. 1 seq.

drums, who could prevent the miserable victims from opposing arm to arm, steel to steel, and from taking the contagion of a just fury from a fury without justice? . . . Let foreign nations judge whether we or our enemies have the guilt of war upon the forehead."[1]

Rouen was captured by the Catholics and sacked. There the King of Navarre, fighting on the Catholic side, received a mortal wound. In the battle of Dreux, the Protestants, led by Coligny and Condé, were worsted, but their power was not broken. Shortly after, the Duke of Guise, who was endeavoring to take Orléans, was assassinated by a Huguenot nobleman. The act was condemned by Calvin, nor had it the sanction of any of the Protestant leaders, however they may have refrained from exerting themselves to hinder it. Coligny declared that he had prevented the execution of similar plots before, that he had no agency in this, but that for the six months previous, from the time when he had heard that the Duke and his brother, the Cardinal, had formed the design to destroy him and his family, he had ceased to exert himself to save the Duke. A year after the massacre of Vassy, the edict of Amboise reëstablished peace on terms more favorable to the high nobles on the Protestant side than the preceding edict, but less favorable to the smaller gentry and to the towns, inasmuch as they were allowed but a single place of worship in a district or bailliage. Paris was excepted: there Protestant worship was not to be tolerated. The capital became more and more a stronghold of Catholic fanaticism. The settlement was negotiated by Condé, but Coligny refused to give his sanction to its provisions, which were most unacceptable to the body of the Protestants, who were confident that better terms might have been made.

This pacification could not be of long endurance. The Huguenots saw from the threatening attitude of the court and the hostile movements of their adversaries that there was no intention to observe it. They anticipated the attack by themselves resorting to arms; a measure which the leaders felt obliged to adopt, though not without grave misgivings. They extorted the Peace of Longjumeau (1568), which, however, reëstablished substantially the Edict of Pacification. Condé's

[1] Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Hist. Universelle* (1616–18). G. de Félice, *Hist. des Protestants de France*, p. 160.

lack of judgment was hardly less conspicuous than his valor in the field.[1] Charles IX. was filled with chagrin and indignation at being driven to make an accommodation with his subjects in arms. The bitter animosity of the Catholics through the country was stirred up against the Huguenots. But a few months before, the Duke of Alva had executed Egmont and Horn in the Netherlands. At Bayonne, where Alva had met the Queen Mother and her daughter, Elizabeth of Spain, he had spared no pains to induce the French court to proceed to extreme measures against the Huguenots. But the young King was then averse to the renewal of the war and to a resort to cruel persecution, and the Queen Mother refused to give way to Alva's persuasions.[2] Her aim was to balance the parties against each other, so that neither of them could be in a position to endanger her own power. The words of Alva, however, made a stronger impression on Montpensier, Montluc, and other Catholic nobles. The last conflict, which the Huguenots had begun, had exasperated all who were not of their party. The Catholic counter-reformation was in progress, and Jesuit preachers inflamed the anger of the Catholic population. Philip and Alva renewed their efforts, which were seconded by the Cardinal of Lorraine in the Council. The Huguenots, the King was told, were rebels; if they were not subdued, he could not be the ruler of the land. Thus war was once more renewed, under Spanish influence and coöperation. The Huguenots were now in arms to defend their liberties against a perfidious conspiracy. The Prince of Condé and the Admiral Coligny had found safety in Rochelle, the town which often proved the bulwark of the Protestant cause, and more than once saved it from fatal disaster. The Edict of Pacification was annulled. The Huguenots were beaten at Jarnac in 1569, where Condé fell, leaving his name to his eldest son Henry, a youth of seventeen; and the same year they were defeated again at Moncontour. Now Rochelle proved its value to the Protestants, who, under Coligny, successfully defended the city against the victorious enemy.

It seems strange that the court should have been inclined

[1] The Duc d'Aumale, who defends the Edict of Amboise, admits that in this last treaty Condé made a false step, and adds, "It must be allowed that his heart was larger than his intellect," i. 264.

[2] The usual opposite representation is corrected by Ranke, i. 193.

to make peace at this time. But the war was not like the former contests, a local one. It was a general war, in which foreign nations were concerned. The Huguenots were aided by money from England and troops from Germany. When they had been shut up in Rochelle, where the Queen of Navarre held her court, they fitted out a small fleet which they used with much effect along the coast. It was a characteristic of Coligny that, though often beaten in the field, he was able, after defeat, to keep together his forces and resume hostilities. He was soon strong enough to sally forth from Rochelle and to traverse France at the head of a body of three thousand horse, the most of whom were Germans, and whose progress, especially as it was known that the young princes, Navarre and Condé, were among them, awakened enthusiasm wherever they appeared. The perseverance of the Huguenots and their continued strength, unexhausted by defeat, constituted one of the arguments for peace. Jealousy of Spain was the other. The ambition of Philip excited alarm among the French. He had a scheme for effecting the liberation of Mary Queen of Scots and of marrying her to Don John of Austria, his half-brother, by which he hoped to bring Scotland, and ultimately England, under Spanish control. He proposed to marry his sister to the young King of France. If these plans should be carried out, England, Scotland, France, and the Netherlands might, like Italy, be made subordinate to Spain. It was felt, moreover, that he was taking part in the war against the Huguenots mainly to promote his selfish interest, and that he rendered less assistance than the enemy gained from their German allies. The court, in 1570, agreed to the treaty of St. Germain, by which the provisions of the Edict of Pacification were revived, and four fortified towns, of which Rochelle was one, were put for two years into the hands of the Huguenots, as a guarantee for their safety and for the fulfillment of the stipulations.

Thus the obstinate refusal to grant a moderate degree of religious liberty led to the necessity of a vastly greater concession, through which the kingdom was divided against itself — another kingdom being, as it were, established within it. Yet it was a measure which the Huguenots, after their experience of the perfidy of the court, had no alternative but to demand.

The conclusion of this peace with the Huguenots brought

upon the European states a political crisis of great moment. It seemed likely that France would take part in a coalition against Philip II. The state of things in the Netherlands at this juncture was favorable for such an alliance. The union of Philip with Venice and with the Pope, and the victory of Lepanto, increased the jealousy with which France and England looked on his ambitious designs. It was proposed that the Duke of Anjou, the heir of the French crown, should marry Queen Elizabeth, and, when this negotiation was broken off, that his younger brother, the Duke d'Alençon, should marry her. The Queen Mother was in apparent, and probably sincere, accord with this new policy. The sons of the Constable Montmorenci were then powerful at court, and it was one of them, the Marshal Francis, who suggested the marriage of the youngest daughter of Catharine, Margaret of Valois, to Henry of Navarre. The Queen Mother fell in with the proposal, and the Huguenots were not averse to it. At about the same time Condé was married to a princess of the house of Cleve. So ardent were the hopes of the Protestants that Coligny himself came to the court and was warmly received by Catharine.

He was a man of the purest and loftiest character. On his own estate, he punctually attended, with his family and dependents, the Calvinistic worship; and at each recurrence of the Lord's Supper, he was at pains to heal all quarrels and differences among his people. He entered into the civil wars with the utmost reluctance and sorrow, in obedience to the imperative call of duty, and in compliance with the counsels of his wife, who equaled him in piety and in nobleness of soul. He did not allow the spirit of a patriot to sink in that of a partisan. Notwithstanding that he stood at the head of a powerful party, and, though a subject, was able to make peace or war, he was broad and disinterested in all his plans. Grave in his deportment, inflexible in his principles, blameless in his morals, with an immutable trust in God, he presents a commanding figure in the midst of the confusion and corruption of the times. It was the hatred of Catharine de Medici to Coligny that led to the massacre of St. Bartholomew. She saw how deeply the King was impressed with his abilities and excellence. Charles IX., sickly in body, like the other sons of Henry II., and with an unhealthy, unregulated nature, — all the bad ten-

dencies of which had been fostered in the base and dissolute society in which he had been reared, and by the influence of his mother, whose supreme purpose was to keep up her own ascendency over him, — now felt for the first time the inspiring influence of a man who could awaken in him something of reverence and love. The Queen saw that day by day she was becoming supplanted, simply by the natural impression which Coligny made upon her son. The best hopes were awakened in Coligny's own mind by the almost filial regard with which the King listened to him. He urged most earnestly that war should be declared against Spain, and the King was inclined to take the step. However Catharine might be disposed to prevent Philip from acquiring a power in France that could be dangerous to herself, she was not of a mind to enter into a war against him; a war, too, that must incidentally add to the prosperity of the Huguenots, and confirm the influence of Coligny over the King. Whom would he follow, Catharine or Coligny? Warm words passed between Coligny and the Queen Mother, in the presence of Charles. The Admiral said that the King might be involved in war, even against his will — referring to the conflict in the Netherlands, into which Coligny was urging him to enter. It was pretended afterwards that he had thrown out a threat of rebellion. Catharine determined to destroy him. She called in the aid of the Guises, his implacable enemies, who longed to avenge upon him the assassination of their relative. Her second son, the Duke of Anjou, afterwards Henry III., on whom she doted and who was equally alarmed at the feeling which the King manifested to Coligny, engaged cordially in the plot. The Duchess of Nemours, the widow of Francis, and the mother of Henry of Guise, willingly aided in devising and carrying out the diabolical scheme. Coligny was wounded by a shot from a window of an adherent of the Guises. This was on the 22d of August, 1572. The wound was not dangerous, and the plot had miscarried. The failure involved the more peril to the authors of it, from the sympathy with the Admiral which the King expressed, and from his indignation at the Guises, who were known to be at the bottom of it. In a visit to Coligny, in which the Queen Mother accompanied the King, the wounded veteran, who at that time thought that the bullets which had struck him might have been poisoned, called

him to the bedside, and, in an undertone, cautioned him against yielding to the counsels of Catharine and the faction with which she had allied herself. By the most importunate urging, she extorted from Charles a statement of what the Admiral had said.

Thereupon the plan of a general massacre was matured. Had it been thought of before? Pains had been taken to collect the Huguenots from all quarters into the city. Catharine had insisted that the marriage should take place there. There is evidence that the idea of seizing on this occasion to cut off some of the Huguenot leaders was not new to the Queen's mind. It is impossible to trace out the sinuosities of a nature so made up of deceit.[1] She was fully capable of weaving two schemes simultaneously, and of availing herself of either as circumstances might dictate. At all events, the failure in the first attempt upon Coligny moved her and her confederates to undertake a general massacre. Henry III., who was one of them, asserted that the King himself, when he had been prevailed upon to acquiesce in the murder of Coligny, demanded that the Huguenots should all be struck down, so that none should be left to cry out against his deed. The court had been absorbed in the festivities attending the marriage of Henry of Navarre. The fanaticism of the people of Paris was inflamed by the presence of the Protestants among them, and efforts were necessary to prevent outbreakings of violence. It was only necessary to unchain the passions of the Catholic populace, and the work of death could be done. The feeble, impulsive, impetuous, half-distracted King was assured that a plot, with Coligny at its head, had been formed against him, and was plied with entreaties, arguments, threats, until his opposition was broken down, and he yielded himself as a passive instrument into the hands of the conspirators.[2] In the night of the

[1] "Cette femme était le mensonge même et l'on se perd dans l'abîme de sa fausseté." Henri Martin, ix. 291. Michelet, in the course of his eloquent narrative of the St. Bartholomew plot, says of Catharine: "Elle était double et fausse avec tous, avec elle-même." *Guerres de Religion*, p. 399.

[2] On the much controverted question, whether the massacre of St. Bartholomew was premeditated, two of the ablest modern historians, Ranke and Henri Martin, are substantially agreed. The material points of their view are indicated above. See Ranke, i. 212 seq., and his examination (v. 97 seq.) of the work of Capefigue: *Histoire de la Réforme, de la Ligue et de Henry IV.* Capefigue is one of the writers who would make the massacre spring wholly from the infuriated state of Catholic feeling in Paris, of which the individuals concerned in it were the mere instruments. Martin (ix. 302) considers that in insisting that

24th of August, at a concerted signal, the murderers fell upon the victims, the destruction of the most eminent of whom had been previously allotted to individuals, the Duke of Guise having taken it in charge to dispatch Coligny. An indiscriminate slaughter of the Huguenots followed. The miserable King was seen to fire upon them from his window. Couriers were sent through the country, and in the other towns the same frightful scenes were enacted. Not less than two thousand were killed in Paris, and as many as twenty thousand in the rest of France. Navarre and Condé were at length obliged to conform to the Catholic Church, to save their lives. The news of the great massacre excited a tumult of joy at Madrid and at Rome. It is said that Philip II., for the first time in his life, laughed aloud. The Pope ordered a *Te Deum*, and by processions and jubilant thanksgivings the Papal court signified the satisfaction with which the intelligence was received. A medal was struck having on one side the image of Gregory XIII., and on the other, the destroying angel, with the words, *Hugonotorum strages* (massacre of the Huguenots). The Pope ordered Vasari to paint and hang up in the Vatican a picture which should represent the slaughter of the Huguenots, and bear the inscription, "*Pontifex Colignii necem probat*" (the Pope approves the slaying of Coligny). Among the fictitious apologies which the French court put forth, that which charged upon the Huguenots a plot against the King and government met with little, if any, credence. Everywhere, except at Madrid and Rome, in the Catholic as well as Protestant nations, the atrocious crime was regarded with horror and with detestation of its perpetrators.

the marriage of Navarre should be at Paris, there was in the mind of the Queen Mother "sinon un projet, au moins, une arrière-pensée sinistre." When Catharine put herself openly at the head of the party of peace, "la vague pensée qui avait toujours flotté dans son esprit se fixe: le fantôme du meurtre prend corps; 'elle tient conseil de se défaire de l'Amiral' (*Mem. de Tavannes*, p. 386)." Martin, p. 302. Henry III.'s narrative of St. Bartholomew is considered genuine by Martin (p. 309, n.). Its genuineness is doubted by Ranke. The view of Ranke and Martin as to the origin of the massacre, not in a plot definitely framed long before, but in the terror and fanaticism excited by the failure of the attempt to assassinate Coligny, is adopted by Soldan, *Frankreich u. die Bartholomäus Nacht;* by Henry White, in his truly learned as well as readable work on the Civil Wars, *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew*, and by other judicious writers. Browning, in his valuable *History of the Huguenots* (ch. xxvii.), errs in attributing to Charles IX. the purpose to decoy the Huguenot leaders to Paris in order to cut them off. See, also, *Cambridge Modern History*, iii. 18 seq.

The Protestants were not subdued by the terrible loss which they had suffered. The burning wrath which it excited among them was a new source of strength. Rochelle still held out. Nor did the Queen Mother desert her previous path or show herself disposed to a close alliance with Philip. She even sought to keep up negotiations for the marriage of Alençon with Elizabeth.

A new turn was given to affairs by the separation of the "Politiques," or liberal Catholics, who were in favor of toleration, from their fanatical brethren. The wisdom and necessity of the policy which L'Hospital had vainly recommended, were now recognized by a strong party. In 1574 the wretched life of Charles IX. came to an end. His brother and successor, Henry III., the favorite of his mother, and most fully imbued with her ideas, and who had been active in contriving the massacre of St. Bartholomew, was wholly incompetent to govern a country that was torn by religious factions, a country whose treasury was exhausted, and whose people were clamorous for deliverance from their heavy burdens of taxation, at the same time that a strong party was demanding radical political reforms. The King endeavored to make his way by craft and double dealing, but lost the confidence of both of the religious parties. In May, 1576, he made his peace with the united Huguenots and Politiques, giving to the former unrestricted religious freedom, with the exception of Paris, and an equal eligibleness to all offices and dignities.

With the coöperation of Spain, Henry of Guise organized the Catholic League, for the maintenance of the Catholic religion and for the extirpation of Protestantism. The Estates at Blois in 1576 demanded that there should be but one religion in the kingdom. The unpopularity of Henry among the extreme Catholics was not only owing to his shuffling course on the religious question, but also to his advancement of personal favorites to the highest offices, and his subjection to their influence, in disregard of the claims of the great nobles. The League commenced another war, the sixth in the series, for the attainment of their ends, and drew the irresolute and helpless King along with them. The result was the securing to the Huguenots of what had been granted them in 1576; but the seventh war, that soon followed, ended in the adoption of the first Edict

of Toleration. In 1584 the Duke of Alençon, who, after the accession of Henry to the throne, had worn the title of the Duke of Anjou, died. Thus Henry of Navarre was left the next heir to the throne. The League, with Spain and Rome at its back, resolved that he should never wear the crown. Sixtus V., shortly after his accession to the Papal chair, issued a bull, in which the two Princes, Navarre and Condé, as heretics, and leaders and promoters of heresy, were declared to have forfeited their dignities and possessions, including all title to the French throne. In the war of the "three Henries," as it was called, Henry of Navarre was supported by England and by troops from Germany and Switzerland. The King, on his return to Paris, found that Henry of Guise was greeted by the multitude as the hero of the war. The attempt of the King to introduce bodies of troops devoted to himself was met by the erection of barricades in the streets of the city, and he was obliged to make a humiliating appeal to Guise to quiet the disorder. The Assembly of the States General at Blois, in 1588, brought forward projects of constitutional reform which reduced the power of the King to a low point. His mortification, resentment, and impatience at the restrictions laid upon him, had now reached their height. He caused the Duke of Guise to be assassinated by the royal bodyguards, and the Duke's brother, the Cardinal of Lorraine, to be dispatched the same day.

Henry III. had now brought on himself the implacable hostility of the League. The fanatical preachers of Paris held him up to the execration of the people. The doctors of the Sorbonne hastened to declare that he had incurred the penalty of excommunication, and that his subjects were of right absolved from their allegiance. The actual excommunication from the Pope followed. It was fortunate for the King that there was an army of Protestants in the field, under Prince Henry of Navarre. The King joined himself to the Prince. The army, made strong by the union of the Huguenots and the Politiques — the liberal Catholics who were still loyal to the sovereign — drew near to Paris. It was thought advisable in the city to set a watch upon the Catholics who were not of the League. At that time, when the royal cause, faithfully supported by Navarre, was gaining ground, a fanatical priest, Clément by name, made his way into the camp and slew the King (1589).

Henry IV. was now the sovereign of France by right of inheritance; but he had been declared ineligible by the Pope, and he had his kingdom to win. The League were disposed to put France under the protection of Philip II. The Duke of Mayenne, the brother of the Guises who were assassinated by order of the King, was at the head of the government which the League provisionally established. The interests of Spain were cared for by the ambassador, Mendoza, an astute diplomatist, whom Elizabeth had found it inconsistent with her safety and that of her kingdom to suffer to remain in England. Philip II. aspired to unite the Catholic nations under his rule, and the League were so lost to the feeling of patriotism as to wish him success. The project of the union of France and Spain failed as far as the League was concerned, only by the jealousy of the Duke of Mayenne, who refused to consent that his nephew, whom it was proposed to marry to Philip's daughter, should wear the crown. The gallantry of Henry of Navarre was conspicuously displayed. In the battle of Ivry, on the 14th of March, 1590, he gained a brilliant victory, which was chiefly due to his personal valor. The strategy of Alexander of Parma, one of the ablest generals of the age, neutralized his successes until that commander died.[1] Besides the discord in the League, which has been noticed, other circumstances gradually turned to the advantage of Henry. The great obstacle in the way of his crushing opposition was the fact that he was a Protestant. When urged to become a Catholic, immediately after the death of Henry III., he had refused, but in such terms as to inspire the hope that he might ultimately accede to the proposal. The portion of the Catholic body that had given him their support would not consent to the elevation of a Protestant to the throne. It was not personal ambition alone, nor was it the desire of repose for himself, which he felt after so long a conflict; it was the opportunity that was given him to restore peace to France that at length moved him to conform to the Catholic Church. It had been urged upon him that the constitution of the kingdom was such that he was morally bound to be a member of the old Church. As King, he believed that

[1] See the remarks of Duc d'Aumale on Henry's military talents, ii. 170. The King was master of tactics, but not a strategist. D'Aumale's work is specially instructive in reference to the constitution of the armies and the military events in the civil wars.

he could shield the Huguenots from persecution, as well as bring to an end the terrible calamities under which France was groaning. As long as he remained outside of the Catholic Church, he could not win the cities to his cause, and he could not hope to reign by the aid of the nobility alone. He had no doubt that salvation was possible in the old Church. Sully, who dwells with much self-complacency on the part which he took in leading the King to abjure Protestantism, assured him that it was not a change of religion; that the foundation of the two systems was the same.[1] But Du Perron, who had before returned to the Catholic Church, and whom Henry afterwards made Bishop of Evreux, had at least an equal influence in persuading the King to follow his example. Specific articles of faith that were presented to him, he refused to sign. But he went into the Church of St. Denis and kneeling before the Archbishop of Bourges, solemnly declared that he would live and die in the Catholic Church, which he promised to protect and defend. As he had not really altered his opinions, the step that he took was one which admits of no moral justification. Beza, who was then near the end of his life, wrote to him a pathetic and solemn warning against it.[2] We cannot conceive of a man like Coligny consenting to abjure his religious profession from any consideration of expediency. Men of the highest type of character do right and leave consequences to Providence. But Henry had been reared in the camp; he had neither the strength of religious convictions nor the purity of life which answered to the standard of the earnest Huguenots. Thus his faults palliate the guilt of an act which, if done by a man of a higher moral tone, would have been attended by an utter ruin of character. The nation was now easily won to his cause. It is gratifying to find the most eminent of the recent writers on French history dissenting from the popular view which assumes that it was demonstrably impossible for Henry to attain to the throne without abandoning his faith. The same writer agrees with distinguished individuals in the Catholic Church, who even at that day preferred that the King should remain an honest Protestant than become a pretended Catholic.[3] It is

[1] *Mémoires*, b. v.

[2] For the remonstrances of other Protestants, see the thorough work of Stähelin, *Der Uebertritt König Heinrichs des Vierten* (Basel, 1862), p. 640.

[3] Martin, x. 329.

unquestionable, however, that the immediate effect was to open his way to the throne and to put an end to the horrors of civil war. He rode into Paris, wearing the white plume which had often waved in the thick of the fight.

The abjuration of Henry might be approved by a Protestant like Sully, in whom religion was subordinate to politics; but it brought consternation and grief to the great body of his faithful Huguenot adherents who had stood by him in the darkest hours, and who now saw the foundations, on which they stood as a party, struck from under their feet. It is remarkable that he retained, to so great an extent, the affection of those who most deplored his change of religion. His captivating qualities gave him an almost irresistible ascendency over the hearts of men. The abjuration of Henry was not the only evil which the Huguenots were destined to experience as a consequence of being a political party. Others, especially nobles, sought and found personal advancement by following the example of their chief. The leadership of the Huguenot party was coveted by persons more eminent for their rank than for their devotion to religion. The continued persecution, of which the Huguenots were the victims, enabled them to rally and preserve their political organization; and the strength which they still manifested indirectly aided the King in carrying into effect the policy of peace and toleration. He aimed to moderate the polemical ardor of the Huguenot champions, and did not conceal his satisfaction when his old friend, Du Plessis Mornay, was convicted, in a disputation with Du Perron, at Fontainebleau, of having unwittingly used inaccurate citations from the ecclesiastical writers.[1]

The administration of Henry, though cut short by the dagger of Ravaillac, was of incalculable advantage to France. With the assistance of the astute Sully, he reorganized the industry, and restored the prosperity of the country. He made war upon Spain, and in the treaty of Vervins in 1598 he recovered the places which had been conquered from France, both by Philip, and by the Duke of Savoy. The Pope was compelled to conclude peace, and to annul his various fulminations against Henry, while the latter refused to make any declaration except

[1] A favorable view of the King's policy in dealing with the Huguenots is given by Ranke, ii. 74 seq.; a less favorable view by Stahelin, p. 627 seq.

that he had returned to the Catholic Church; and he adhered to his promise to protect both religions. The idea of his foreign policy, which was that of weakening the power of Spain and of Hapsburg, and of extending the boundaries of France, was afterwards taken up by Richelieu, and fully realized. In the Edict of Nantes, in 1598, Henry secured to the Huguenots that measure of religious liberty, and the guarantees of it, for which they had contended. It left fortified cities in their hands, thus perpetuating the existence of an organized power within the State; but this was a necessity of the times. With this exception, his domestic policy involved the concentration of power in the monarch; and in this respect, Richelieu followed in his footsteps. But if the accession of Henry IV. brought a comparative security to the Calvinists of France, this was the limit of its advantage to them. From a religious body, animated with the purpose to bring the whole country to the adoption of their principles, they were reduced to the condition of a defensive party, confined by metes and bounds, which it could not overpass; a party more and more separated from the Catholic population, and exposed, besides, to the evils consequent on keeping up a political and military organization. From this moment Protestantism in France ceased to grow.

CHAPTER IX

THE REFORMATION IN THE NETHERLANDS

The Netherlands formed a most valuable portion of the inherited dominions of Charles V. The Dukes of Burgundy, the descendants of King John of France, taking advantage of the weakness of the French crown and of the wars between France and England, had built up by marriage, purchase, and conquest, or by more culpable means, a rich and powerful dominion. The Duchy of Burgundy gradually extended its confines, until, in the reign of Charles V., it comprised seventeen provinces, and was nearly coextensive with the territory included in the present kingdoms of Holland and Belgium. All of the old writers describe in glowing language the unequaled prosperity and thrift of the Low Countries, and the skill and intelligence of the people.[1] Agriculture, manufactures, and commerce were equally flourishing and lucrative. There were three hundred and fifty cities, some of them the largest and busiest in Europe. Antwerp, with a population of one hundred thousand inhabitants, at a time when London had only one hundred and fifty thousand, was the resort of merchants from every quarter, and had a trade surpassing that of any other European city. The people of the Netherlands were noted not less for their ingenuity, shown in the invention of machines and implements, and for their proficiency in science and letters, than for their opulence and enterprise. It was their boast that common laborers, even the fishermen who dwelt in the huts of Friesland, could read and write, and discuss the interpretation of Scripture. Local self-government existed to a remarkable extent throughout the

[1] Strada, *De Bello-Belgico*, tom. i. For a description of the state of the Low Countries, see Häusser, *Gsch. d. Zeitalt. d. Ref.*, p. 328 seq. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip II.*, b. ii. ch. 1; Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, i. 81 seq. Th. Juste, *Hist. de la Revol. des Pays-Bas*, tom. i. l. v. Holzwarth, *Der Abfall d. Niederländer* (3 vols., 1866–72). The facts are drawn from Guicciardini, *Belgicæ Descriptio* (1652), Strada, Basnage, *Annales des Provinces-Unis* (1719), and other sources.

seventeen provinces. Each had its own chartered rights, privileges, and immunities, and its immemorial customs, which the sovereign was bound to keep inviolate. The people loved their freedom. Charles V., with all the advantages derived from his vast power, could not amalgamate the provinces, or fuse them under a common system, and was obliged to satisfy himself with being the head of a confederacy of little republics. But at the Diet of Augsburg, in 1548, he succeeded in legalizing the separation of the Netherlands into a distinct, united portion of the Empire, paying its own tax, in a gross amount, into the treasury; having certain special rights in the Diet; entitled to protection, but exempt from the jurisdiction of the imperial judiciary, to which other parts of the Empire were subject.

In such a population, among the countrymen of Erasmus, where, too, in previous ages, various forms of innovation and dissent had arisen, the doctrines of Luther must inevitably find an entrance. They were brought in by foreign merchants, "together with whose commodities," writes the old Jesuit historian, Strada, "this plague often sails." They were introduced with the German and Swiss soldiers, whom Charles V. had occasion to bring into the country. Protestantism was also transplanted from England by numerous exiles who fled from the persecution of Mary. The contiguity of the country to Germany and France provided abundant avenues for the incoming of the new opinions. "Nor did the Rhine from Germany, or the Meuse from France," to quote the regretful language of Strada, "send more water into the Low Countries, than by the one the contagion of Luther, by the other of Calvin, was imported into the same Belgic provinces." [1] The spirit and occupations of the people, the whole atmosphere of the country, were singularly propitious for the spread of the Protestant movement. The cities of Flanders and Brabant, especially Antwerp, very early furnished professors of the new faith. Charles V. issued, in 1521, from Worms, an edict, the first of a series of barbarous enactments or "placards," for the extinguishing of heresy in the Netherlands; and it did not remain a dead letter.[2] In

[1] Strada, Stapleton's translation (1667), p. 36. On the causes of the rapid spread of Protestantism in the Low Countries, see Th. Juste, i. 319, 320. Juste is a moderate Catholic, and writes with impartiality.

[2] The main parts of the first "Placard" are given by Brandt, *History of the Reformation in the Low Countries*, i. 42.

1523, two Augustinian monks were burned at the stake in Brussels. After the fire was kindled, they repeated the Apostles' Creed, and sang the *Te Deum Laudamus*.[1] This execution drew from Luther an inspiriting letter to the persecuted Christians of Holland and Brabant, and moved him to write the stirring hymn, — beginning, "Ein neues Lied wir heben an," — of which the following is one of the stanzas: —

> "Quiet their ashes will not lie:
> But scattered far and near,
> Stream, dungeon, bolt, and grave defy,
> Their foeman's shame and fear.
> Those whom alive the tyrant's wrongs
> To silence could subdue,
> He must, when dead, let sing the songs
> Which in all languages and tongues,
> Resound the wide world through."[2]

The edicts against heresy were imperfectly executed. The Regent, Margaret of Savoy, was lukewarm in the business of persecution; and her successor, Maria, the Emperor's sister, the widowed Queen of Hungary, was still more leniently disposed. The Protestants rapidly increased in number. Calvinism, from the influence of France, and of Geneva where young men were sent to be educated, came to prevail among them. Anabaptists and other fanatical or licentious sectaries, such as appeared elsewhere in the wake of the Reformation, were numerous; and their excesses afforded a plausible pretext for violent measures of repression against all who departed from the old faith.[3] In 1550 Charles V. issued a new Placard, in which the former persecuting edicts were confirmed, and in which a reference was made to Inquisitors of the faith, as well as to the ordinary judges of the bishops. This excited great

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[2] "Die Aschen will nicht lassen ab,
Sie stäubt in aller Landen.
Hie hilft kein Bach, Loch, Grub noch Grab;
Sie macht den Feind zu Schanden
Die er im Leben durch den Mord
Zu schweigen hat gedrungen,
Die muss er todt an allem Ort
Mit aller Stimm', und Zungen
Gar fröhlich lassen singen." Gieseler, IV. i. 2, § 24.

[3] The Anabaptist offenses against decency and order are naturally dwelt upon by writers disposed to apologize for the persecutions in the Netherlands; as Leo, *Universal Geschichte*, iii. 327 seq.; and in his earlier work, *Zwolf Bücher Niederländische Geschichte*. But the facts and circumstances are also faithfully detailed by Brandt and other writers whose sympathies are on the other side.

alarm, since the Inquisition was an object of extreme aversion and dread. The foreign merchants prepared to leave Antwerp, prices fell, trade was to a great extent suspended; and such was the disaffection excited, that the Regent Maria interceded for some modification of the obnoxious decree. Verbal changes were made, but the fears of the people were not quieted; and it was published at Antwerp in connection with a protest of the magistrates in behalf of the liberties which were put in peril by a tribunal of the character threatened. "And," says the learned Arminian historian, "as this affair of the Inquisition and the oppression from Spain prevailed more and more, all men began to be convinced that they were destined to perpetual slavery." Although there was much persecution in the Netherlands during the long reign of Charles, yet the number of martyrs could not have been so great as fifty thousand, the number mentioned by one writer, much less one hundred thousand, the number given by Grotius.[1]

In 1555 Charles V., enfeebled by his lifelong enemy, the gout, which was aggravated by reverses of fortune, — mindful too, it is said, of a former saying of one of his commanders, that "between the business of life, and the day of death, a space ought to be interposed," — resigned his throne, and devolved upon his son, Philip II., the government of the Netherlands, together with the rest of his wide dominions in Spain, Italy, and the New World. Political and religious absolutism was the main article of Philip's creed. His ideas were few in number, but he clung to them with the more unyielding tenacity. The liberties of Spain had been destroyed at the beginning of Charles's reign; and the absolute system that was established there, Philip considered the only true or tolerable form of government. To rule, as far as possible, according to this method, wherever he had authority, was an established purpose in his mind. At the same time, he was resolved to stand forth as the champion of the Roman Catholic Church, and the unrelenting foe of heresy, wherever he could reach it. The Spanish monarchy had worn a religious character from the days of Ferdinand and Isabella. Its discoveries and conquests in the New World had been pushed in the spirit of religious propagandism. The

[1] "Nam post carnificata hominum non minus centum millia," etc. — *Annales et Hist. de Rebus Belg.*, l. i. p. 12.

crusade against the Moors had whetted the fanatical zeal against heresy. In Spain the Inquisition was an essential instrument of the civil administration. By nature, and by the influence of the circumstances in which he was placed, Philip was the implacable enemy of religious dissent. Moreover, he knew that if he granted liberty of conscience in one part of his dominions, he might have to meet a similar demand in another — in Spain itself. The counsels of his father, in whom, as he advanced in years, superstition acquired an increasing sway, confirmed Philip in his intolerant bigotry.[1] There had been a mutual love between Charles and the people of the Netherlands. They were proud of him as a countryman, and his affable manners in intercourse with them kept up his popularity. His persecution of the Protestants and his cruelty after the suppression of the insurrection at Ghent, did not suffice to alienate the loyal and affectionate regard of his subjects. But Philip was a Spaniard, and showed it in all his demeanor towards them. "He spoke seldom, and then all Spanish." His mingled shyness and arrogance repelled and disgusted them. In the room of cordially meeting their expressions of enthusiasm, he seemed desirous of escaping from them.[2]

Among this wealthy, spirited, cultivated people, Philip seemed inclined to introduce his despotic system. The great nobles of the country, of whom William, Prince of Orange, and the Counts Egmont and Horn were the chief, might naturally expect to be intrusted with the principal management of the

[1] The bigotry of the Emperor, as well as other traits which he manifested after his abdication, are set forth in the highly interesting work of Stirling, *The Cloister Life of Charles V.* The other writers on the subject are Gachard, *Retraite et Mort de Charles Quint;* Mignet, *Charles Quint, son Abdication, son Séjour et sa Mort au Monastère de Yuste.* These authors are reviewed by Prescott, *History of Philip II.* (end of b. i.); and in his edition of Robertson's History of Charles V., iii. 327 seq., in connection with Prescott's own historical essay on the same theme. Of course the Emperor never made the remark often attributed to him, that he had been foolish in trying to produce uniformity of opinion between sects, when he could not make two clocks or watches accord. Macaulay traces the saying to a reflection of Strada, who observes that Charles governed the wheels of clocks easier than fortune. Pichot traces it to Van Male, Charles's Latin Secretary, by whom an observation of Seneca, respecting the disputes of philosophers, is borrowed and applied to the controversies of doctors. Pichot, *Chronique de Charles Quint* (1854), vol. i. p. 444. The Emperor's expression of regret that he had not burned Luther at Worms shows his real mind. Juste, i. 98, Prescott's Robertson, iii. 482. From Yuste he addressed to the Spanish Inquisitors and to Philip exhortations to cruelty. *Ibid.*, pp. 463, 464. His fanaticism and intolerance appear in his codicil, in his injunctions to Philip.

[2] Juste, i. 124.

government under the King. William, though born of Lutheran parents, had been brought up from his boyhood in the court of Charles V., and was a Catholic by profession, but opposed to persecution. His extraordinary abilities had made him a favorite of the Emperor, who gave him responsible employments and signified his particular regard by leaning upon his shoulder, at the ceremony of the abdication, and by selecting him to convey the imperial crown to his brother Ferdinand. Egmont, with far less depth of sagacity and steadiness of character than Orange, was a nobleman of brilliant courage and attractive manners, and had won high fame in connection with the victories of Gravelines and St. Quentin. The nobles, both these and others of inferior rank, were luxurious in their style of living, and their lavish expenditures had brought on many of them heavy burdens of debt.

Philip did not select his Regent from the aristocracy of the country, nor did he appoint any other whom the nobles would have preferred; but he appointed to this office Margaret of Parma, the illegitimate daughter of Charles V., a person of uncommon talents and energy, and utterly devoted to the will of her brother. She was accomplished in the art of dissimulation and double-dealing, which formed an essential part of Philip's method of governing. She nourished the King's jealousy of Orange and Egmont. In the first act of selecting a Regent, Philip showed a caution that partook of suspicion. At her side he placed, as her principal adviser, Granvelle, the Bishop of Arras. His father was of humble birth, but had raised himself to an important station under the Emperor, by whom the talents of the son were also discerned. Granvelle, the younger, was an able and accomplished man and well acquainted with the country, but servilely devoted to the King. The three nobles were placed in the Council, but the secret directions of Philip to the Regent were such that the conduct of affairs was really in the hands of Granvelle (1559).

In the midst of the murmurs and fears which the organization of the government excited, the attempt was made to retain in the Netherlands several regiments of Spanish soldiers. This measure was undertaken when there was no sign of an insurrection. It was in violation of the ancient rights of the Provinces, and imposed a burden which was the more onerous, since, in

the previous year, there had been universal suffering from the scarcity of provisions. Philip had pledged his word, on leaving the Netherlands, that the troops should be withdrawn within four months; but that pledge was disregarded. The disaffection increased to such a degree, that the Regent at length availed herself of a convenient pretext for sending them away. Philip reluctantly acquiesced in what she pronounced an absolute necessity if the country was to be saved from insurrection.

The second of these irritating measures was the creation of a large number of new bishoprics. Whatever plausible reasons might be urged in favor of this measure, from the great size of the existing dioceses, and their inconvenient relations to the contiguous German bishoprics, the real design of it was not misunderstood.[1] It was a part of the machinery to be employed for tightening the cords of Church discipline, and for the extermination of heresy. The new bishops were to be clothed with inquisitorial powers. The creation of so many important personages, devoted, of course, to the sovereign, was counted a disadvantage to the old hereditary aristocracy of the country.

The two measures of the retention of the troops, and the imposition of the bishops — measures having an ominous relation to one another — revealed unmistakably the policy of Philip. The apologists of the King charge the troubles that ensued upon the ambition of the nobles, especially of William, who, it is said, wanted to govern the country themselves, and did all they could to excite disaffection. It may be granted that they were not free from the influence of personal motives, and chafed under the arrangements which deprived them of their natural and legitimate place in the control of public affairs. The charge that either of them aimed at a revolution is destitute of proof. In the midst of all that is subject to controversy, two things cannot reasonably be disputed. One is that foreign domination, that is, the rule of Spanish officers, and the presence of Spanish soldiery, were as hateful to the Netherlanders as they were to the Germans. It was what contributed most to the reaction against Charles V., after the Smalcaldic war, and to the triumph of Maurice. The other fact is, that persecution, the forcible repression of heresy, after the manner of Spanish Catholicism, was repugnant to the general feeling of the people — of the

[1] Juste, ii. 166, 279.

Catholic population — of the Low Countries. There was an atmosphere of freedom, and a state of public opinion, to which the policy of Philip was thoroughly opposed. William afterwards declared that, while hunting in company with Henry II. of France, that monarch had incautiously revealed to him the secret designs of himself and Philip for the extirpation of heresy in their dominions. In Philip's scheme for the increase of bishops, and in his detention of the troops, William saw the beginning of the execution of the plot; and he determined, he says, that he would do what he could to rid the land of "the Spanish vermin." That William looked about for a high matrimonial connection, does not indicate any deep-laid plan of unlawful personal advancement nor in his marriage with Anna, of Saxony, was there any serious attempt to mislead Philip as to the religion to be adopted by his bride.[1] William was charged with cherishing Macchiavellian principles; but the age was Macchiavellian, and he does not appear to have often transgressed the bounds of morality in the use of that profound sagacity by which he coped with unscrupulous adversaries.

Philip renewed the persecuting edicts of Charles V. It was forbidden to print, copy, keep, hide, buy, or sell any writing of Luther, Zwingli, Œcolampadius, Bucer, Calvin, or of any other heretic; to break or to injure any image of the Virgin, or of the Saints; to hold or to attend any heretical conventicle. Laymen were prohibited from reading the Scriptures, or taking part in conferences upon disputed points of doctrine. Transgressors, in case they should recant, were, if they were men, to be beheaded; if women, to be buried alive. If obstinate, they were to be burnt alive, and, in either case, their property was to be confiscated. To omit to inform against suspicious persons, to entertain, lodge, feed, or clothe them, was to be guilty of heresy. Persons who, for the reason that they were suspected, were condemned to abjure heresy, were, in case they rendered themselves again suspicious, to be dealt with as heretics. Every accuser, in case of conviction, was to receive a large share of the confiscated goods. Judges were absolutely forbidden to diminish in any way the prescribed penalties. Severe penalties were threatened against any who should intercede for heretics or pre-

[1] Compare Prescott, i. 485, with Motley, i. 300 seq. William's wife was to "live catholically."

sent a petition in behalf of them. To carry out these enactments, Charles had established an Inquisition, which was not only independent of the clergy of the country, but to which they were all, from the highest to the lowest, answerable. This was not the *Spanish* Inquisition, but it was sufficiently rigorous to lead Philip to pronounce it more pitiless than that of Spain.[1] But, terrible as the Inquisition in the Netherlands was, it wanted some of the barbarous features that belonged to the Holy Office in Spain. It was said by Philip, and has been urged by his defenders since, that the persecuting edicts were the work of Charles, and that his successor simply continued them in operation. This statement overlooks the circumstances that they put the authority of Charles, popular though he was, to a severe test; that they were not systematically enforced; that the cruelties inflicted under them had more and more awakened the hostility of the people to such measures; and that in the interval between the promulgation of them by Charles and the renewal of them by Philip, the new opinions had gained a wider acceptance.[2]

As the Inquisition proceeded with its bloody work, the indignation of the people found utterance through Orange and Egmont, who remonstrated against the cruelties which were inflicted, and complained to the King of Granvelle, on whom they laid the responsibility of everything that was done.

Granvelle is exculpated by Philip from all responsibility for the introduction of the new bishops; and he did not originate some other obnoxious measures which were laid to his credit.[3] His impulses were not cruel. But the lords were not out of the

[1] "Ce qu'on débite sur l'intention du Roi d'établir aux Pays Bas l'inquisition d'Espagne, est également faux; jamais le cardinal ne lui a fait cette proposition, ni lui-même n'y a pensé. D'ailleurs l'inquisition des Pays-Bas est plus impitoyable que celle d'Espagne." — Gachard, *Correspondence de Philippe II.*, i. 207.

[2] Orange sets forth some of these altered circumstances in a letter to the Regent (January 24, 1566). He speaks of the Placards as "quelquefois limités et non ensuivis à la rigeur, mêsme en temps que la misère universelle n'estoit si aspre comme maintenant et notre peuple, par imitation et practicques de nos voisins, non tant enclen a novellite," etc. He depicts plainly the fatal consequences that will result from perseverance in the severe policy of the King. Groen Van Prinsterer, *Archives de la Maison d'Orange-Nassau*, tome ii. p. 19.

[3] The points on which Granvelle was erroneously accused are presented by Gachard, *Correspondence*, etc., i. clxx. seq. (Preliminary *Rapport.*) One of the worst things that Granvelle did was to recommend the kidnapping of William's son, who was taken from Louvain, where he was studying, and carried to Spain. There he was kept, and trained up in the Catholic religion.

way in finding in him the embodiment of the foreign domination which was striking at the liberties of the country. Whatever opinion he might privately hold as to the wisdom of some of the measures of Philip, he never faltered in his obedience. He knew no higher law than the will of his master. The new arrangement of dioceses abridged his own episcopal power, and would naturally be unwelcome; but when he was made Archbishop of Mechlin, and then, at the intercession of the Regent, received from Rome the cardinal's hat, the personal dislike of the lords to him as an upstart, and their patriotic opposition to the policy of which he was the chief executor, reached their climax. The effect of the complaints of the nobles against the Cardinal was to kindle in Philip's mind an inextinguishable hostility to them.[1] At length the Regent, impatient of her dependent position with reference to Granvelle, and willing that he should bear all the odium, took sides against him. The excitement became so formidable that Philip found a pretext for removing him from the country, as if at his own request; but the Inquisition went forward with even greater energy in the work of burning and burying alive its victims. It even put to death those who were merely suspected of harboring heretical opinions. The great lords, who on the departure of the Cardinal had returned to the Council, from which they had previously withdrawn, felt that they were deemed to be in part answerable for the incessant murders perpetrated in the name of justice and religion; and when Philip determined to promulgate the decrees of Trent, the Prince of Orange broke through his reserve and startled the Council by a bold and powerful speech upon the unrighteous and dangerous policy which the government was pursuing. The general sense of the country recoiled from that strict ecclesiastical discipline, which the reactionary Catholic party in Europe were seeking to establish. It was determined to dispatch Egmont to Madrid to open the eyes of the King to the real situation. The cordiality with which he was received, and the honors that were rendered him in the Spanish court, made him satisfied with the smooth but vague and unmeaning assurances of Philip. Egmont was the more incensed, when,

[1] In the letter in which he denied the truth of certain allegations against Granvelle, he asserts that this minister had never advised him to pacify the country by cutting off a half dozen heads; but Philip adds to the denial "Quoique serait peut-être pas mal de recourir à ce moyen." Gachard, i. 207.

after his return, he found that he had been duped, and that the old edicts were to be sharply enforced without a jot of concession.[1] The announcement that the persecution was to go on without the least mitigation filled the land with consternation. The foreign merchants fled, as from a pestilence, and Antwerp, the principal mart, was silent. The irritation of the people found a vent in a multitude of angry or satirical publications, which no vigilance of the Inquisition could prevent from seeing the light.[2]

About five hundred nobles, to whom burghers were afterwards added, united in an agreement called the *Compromise*, by which they pledged themselves to withstand the Spanish tyranny, the Inquisition that was crushing the country, and every violent act which should be undertaken against any one of their number. In this league were Count Louis of Nassau, a man of high courage, but more excitable and radical than his brother; the accomplished St. Aldegonde, and Brederode, whose character was less entitled to respect, but who was full of spirit and daring. They contemplated at the outset only legal means of resistance. But in their ranks were found some who hoped to mend their fortunes by political commotion. The great nobles stood aloof from the association. William especially was wise enough to perceive that it would accomplish nothing effectual, but rather imperil the cause which all had at heart. The members resolved on a great public demonstration, and waited on the Regent in a body with a petition that, until a repeal of the edicts could be procured, she would suspend the execution of them. She bridled her indignation, but Barlaymont, one of the Council, was known to have styled them "a band of beggars." They accepted the title and adopted the beggar's sack and bowl for their symbols. Multitudes of people began now to assemble all over the open country, for the purpose of listening to the Calvinist preachers

[1] The cruel orders of Philip are given in his famous dispatch from the forest of Segovia (October 17, 1565). Gachard, I. cxxix.

[2] Granvelle's correspondence bears constant witness to the general antipathy towards the Spaniards — "La mauvaise volonté que l'on témoigne ici universellement a tous les Espagnols," as he styles it, in one place (*Papiers d'Etat du Cardinal de Granvelle*, tome vii. p. 52). This antipathy he attributes to the industry of the lords in propagating calumnies in regard to the intention of the King to bring in the Spanish Inquisition, to rule there as he ruled in Italy, etc. Granvelle recommends the bestowal of offices and distinctions such as places of trust in Italy, upon Netherlanders, in order to create a Spanish feeling among the friends of persons thus honored, and among aspirants for like favors.

and of worshiping according to their own preference. From ten to twenty thousand persons would gather, the women and children being placed for safety in the center, and the whole assembly being encircled by armed men, with watchmen stationed to give warning of approaching danger. They listened to a sermon, sang Psalms, and used the opportunity to perform the rite of baptism, or the marriage service where it was desired. Orange obtained from the Regent the allowance that the preaching in the country, outside of the cities, should not be disturbed. The popular movement was so powerful that she found herself helpless (1566).

Philip had stubbornly refused to comply with the urgent requests of the Regent that the edicts might be softened. Two nobles, Berghen and Montigny, were sent to represent to him the condition of the country, and the extent of the popular indignation. The King at length recognized the perils of the situation, and wrote to the Regent that the Inquisition might cease, provided the new bishops were suffered to exercise their functions freely; that he was disposed to moderate the Placards, but that time would be required to mature the measure; and that the Regent might give, not only the Confederates, but others also, an assurance of pardon. At the same time, on the 9th of August, 1566, in the presence of a notary, and before the Duke of Alva and other witnesses, he signed a secret declaration that, notwithstanding the assurance given to the Duchess of Parma, since he had not acted in this matter freely and spontaneously, he did not consider himself bound by that promise, but reserved to himself the right to punish the guilty parties, and especially the authors and fomenters of the sedition.[1] He wrote also to the Nuncio of the Pope, with an injunction of secrecy, an expression of his purpose to maintain the Inquisition and the edicts in all their rigor.[2] Philip has thus left behind him the documentary proof of his perfidy, or his deliberate design to break his word to a nation.

While the country was thus agitated, in the summer of 1566, there burst forth the storm of iconoclasm that swept over the

[1] Gachard, I. cxxxiii. 443.

[2] *Ibid.*, 422. See, also, Motley, i. 531. The Nuncio, the Archbishop of Sorrento, had been sent to the Netherlands ostensibly to look after the reformation of the clergy: really, as the secret correspondence shows, in reference to the Inquisition and the extirpation of heresy.

land, destroying the paintings, images, and other symbols and instruments of Catholic worship, from those which adorned the great cathedral of Antwerp, to such as decorated the humblest chapels and convents. In Flanders alone more than four hundred churches were sacked. The work of destruction was accomplished by mobs hastily gathered, and was one fruit of the excitement and exasperation provoked by the terrible persecution. Magistrates and burghers, whether Catholic or Protestant, looked on, offering no resistance to the progress of the tempest. However it may be condemned, it was not exactly like the invasion of the temples of one religious denomination by another. These edifices were felt to belong to the people in common; all had some right in them. Calvinists at that period habitually looked upon the use of images in worship, and upon the mass, as forms of idolatry, of a sin explicitly forbidden in the decalogue. Similar uprisings of the populace took place in France and in Scotland, and from the same causes. The Protestant ministers and the Prince of Orange, with other chiefs of the liberal party, generally denounced the image breaking.[1] The effect of it was disastrous. What the iconoclasts considered the destruction of the implements of an impious idolatry, the Catholics abhorred as sacrilege. The patriotic party was divided, and besides this advantage gained by the government, a plausible pretext was afforded for the most sanguinary retaliation. The Regent was obliged, however, to make a truce with the Confederacy of nobles, in which it was agreed that the Inquisition should be given up and liberty allowed to the new doctrine, while the confederates in return, as long as the promises to them should be kept, were to abandon their association. Orange undertook to quell the disturbances in Antwerp, and Egmont in Flanders; the latter manifesting his loyalty to Catholicism and his anger at the iconoclasts by brutal severities. The Regent exhibited the utmost energy in repressing disorder and in punishing the offenders. Valenciennes, which endeavored to stand a siege, was taken and heavily punished. Order was everywhere restored. Orange foresaw what course Philip would

[1] Motley, i. 570. Whether the popular leaders encouraged the image breaking or not, is one of the disputed points. That they did is maintained by Koch, *Untersuchungen über die Empörung u. den Abfall d. Niederlande von Spanien* (1861), p. 115 seq. Juste (ii. 184) holds the contrary opinion. Koch writes in a polemical, partisan spirit, but some of his criticisms upon Motley are worthy of attention. See, also, *Cambridge Modern History*, iii. 208.

pursue. He would not take the oath of unlimited obedience to what the King might choose to command, and separating regretfully from Egmont and Horn, who had more confidence in Philip, he retired to Dillenburg, in Nassau, the ancient seat of his family. From the moment when Philip heard the news of the iconoclastic disturbances, he had no thought but that of armed coercion and vengeance. While he was preparing a military force so strong that he expected to cut off all hope of resistance, he veiled his designs by assurances to the Regent and to the Council that his policy was to be one of mildness, clemency, and grace, with the avoidance of all harshness.[1] It was fortunate that there was one man whom he could not deceive.

What the Regent most deprecated was the sending of the Duke of Alva to the Netherlands, to whom she had a strong personal antipathy, and whose coming, as she knew, would undo at once the work of pacification, which she considered herself, through her resolute proceedings, to have nearly accomplished. But in accordance with Alva's advice, Philip had resolved on a scheme of savage repression and punishment, and Alva was the person selected to carry it out. His reputation was very high as a military man, although his talents seem not to have fitted him for the management of large armies; he had a contracted, but clear and crafty intellect, immeasurable arrogance, inflexible obstinacy, and a heart of stone. Conciliation and mercy were terms not found in his vocabulary. His theory, like that of Philip, was that the great lords were at the bottom of the disaffection of the inferior nobility, and that these in turn were the movers of sedition among the people. Neither the King nor his General could comprehend a spontaneous, common sentiment pervading a nation. Alva conceived that the great mistake of Charles V. had been in sparing the captive leaders in the Smalcaldic war. From the Emperor's experience he derived a conclusive argument against every policy but that of unrelenting severity in dealing with rebels and heretics. Such was the man who was chosen to settle the disturbances in the Netherlands. He conducted a body of ten thousand Spanish troops from Italy to that country. As his course lay near to Geneva, Pope Pius V. desired him to turn aside and exterminate this

[1] Gachard, I. xlviii. 487, 488.

"nest of devils and apostates." But he declined to deviate from his chosen route, maintained perfect discipline among his soldiers during the long and perilous march, and even gave a sort of organization to the hundreds of courtesans who followed his army. On his arrival, he endeavored to disarm suspicion, and gradually made known the extent of the authority committed to him, which was equivalent to that of a dictator. The Regent found herself wholly divested of real power. Egmont and Horn were decoyed to Brussels by gracious and flattering words, and then treacherously arrested and cast into prison. The terrible tribunal was erected, which was appropriately named by the people, "the Council of Blood," and the work of death began. Soon the prisons were crowded with inmates, not a few of whom were dragged from their beds at midnight. The executioners were busy from morning till evening. Among the victims, the rich were specially numerous, since one end which Alva kept in view was the providing of a revenue for his master. Every one who had taken part in the petitions against the new bishoprics or the Inquisition, or in favor of softening the edicts of persecution, was declared guilty of high treason. Every nobleman who had been concerned in presenting the petitions, or had approved of them; all nobles and officers who, under the plea of a pressure of circumstances, had permitted the sermons; every one who had taken part, in any way, in the heretical mass meetings, and had not hindered the destruction of the images; all who had expressed the opinion that the King had no right to take from the provinces their liberty, or that the present tribunal was restricted by any laws or privileges, were likewise made guilty of treason. Death and loss of property were the invariable penalty. In three months eighteen hundred men were sent to the scaffold. Persons were condemned for singing the songs of the *Gueux*, or for attending a Calvinistic burial years before; one for saying that in Spain, also, the new doctrine would spread; and another for saying that one must obey God rather than man. Finally, on the 16th of February, 1568, all the inhabitants of the Netherlands, with a few exceptions that were named, were actually condemned to death as heretics!

Orange was active in devising means of deliverance. His brother, Louis of Nassau, entered Friesland, in April, 1568, at the head of an army, and gained a victory over the forces com-

manded by Count Aremberg. In order to strike terror and to secure himself in the rear, Alva hurried through the process against Egmont and Horn, and they were beheaded in the great square at Brussels. Alva then marched against the army of Louis, which he defeated and dispersed. He succeeded, also, by avoiding a combat, in baffling William, whose army was composed of materials that could not be long kept together. The rule of Alva was the more firmly established by the unsuccessful attempts to overthrow it, and he pursued for several years longer his murderous work. The entire number of judicial homicides under his administration he himself reckoned at eighteen thousand. Multitudes emigrated from the country; manufactories were deserted, and business was paralyzed. In 1569 he determined to put in operation a system of taxation that should fill the coffers of the King. He ordained that an extraordinary tax should be levied of one per cent on property of all kinds; and that a permanent tax of five per cent should be paid on every sale of real estate, and ten per cent on every sale of merchandise. This scheme, as ill calculated for its end as it was barbarous in its oppressiveness, raised such a storm of opposition, that Alva himself was moved to make a compromise, which consisted in postponing the execution of it for two years. His enemies, Granvelle and others, were continually laboring to undermine the King's confidence in him, and not wholly without success. In 1570 an Act of amnesty was solemnly proclaimed at Antwerp, which, however, left the old edicts in full force, and only ordained that those against whom nothing was to be charged should go unpunished, provided within a definite time they should penitently sue for grace and obtain absolution from the Church! The spirit of resistance had been slowly awakening, and it gathered strength from these senseless proceedings. When, on the 31st of July, 1571, Alva commanded that the taxes should be levied according to his scheme, the shops were closed, and the people of all the provinces assumed so menacing an attitude that he deemed it best to except four articles — corn, wine, flesh, and beer — from the operation of his decree. But this did not produce the desired effect: labor and traffic were suspended. Alva was deeply incensed and ready to set the hangman at work again, when he heard of the capture of Briel by the "sea-beggars," as they were called; the hardy

inhabitants of the coasts of Holland and Zealand, who had organized themselves into predatory bands under their admiral, William de la Mark. The Prince of Orange was unremitting in his exertions to raise forces capable of effecting the deliverance of his country. Holland and Zealand threw off the yoke of Alva, and, in accordance with William's suggestions, adopted a free constitution. By the estates of Holland, William was recognized as the King's Stadtholder, the show of a connection with Spain being not yet abandoned. He was at the head of an army with every hope of success, when the news of the slaughter of St. Bartholomew and of the death of Coligny, which cut off the expectation of aid from France, disappointed this hope. Mons, where his brother was, had to be given up, and the army melted away. But Alva was weary of his office and began to be sensible of his failure to effect the result which he had been so confident of his ability to secure. The boundless hatred of the people against him was daily manifest. He read it in the looks of all whom he met. Philip, though slow to learn, began to see that his hopes had not been fulfilled. Alva sought and obtained a recall, and, at the end of the year 1573, left the Netherlands, never to return.

From the capture of Briel may be dated the commencement of the long and arduous struggle which resulted in the building up of the Dutch Republic, and the ultimate prostration of the power of Spain. The most powerful Empire in the world was kept at bay, and eventually defeated by a few small states which were goaded to resistance by unparalleled cruelty, and inspired with an unexampled degree of patriotic self-sacrifice. The hero of this memorable struggle was William of Orange. Requesens, the successor of Alva, equaled his predecessor in military skill, and was even more dangerous, in consequence of his conciliatory temper, which might divide and deceive his antagonists. A delusive amnesty was more to be dreaded than open and fierce hostility. In the field the Spaniards were victorious. In 1574 Louis of Nassau was defeated and slain. But they experienced a reverse in the unsuccessful siege of Leyden, whose heroic defense is one of the most notable events of the long war. A new Protestant state was growing up in the North, under the guidance of Orange; and all negotiations looking to peace were fruitless, since Spain refused to grant toleration. This was the

one thing which Philip would not yield. He could not consent to rule over heretics. In the South, where Catholicism prevailed, Requesens was more successful. But the death of this commander, in 1576, was followed by a frightful revolt of his soldiers in the various cities where they were stationed; and the scenes of murder and pillage that attended it, which were most appalling in populous and wealthy Antwerp, taught the southern provinces what they had to dread from Spanish domination. The nobles of Flanders and Brabant, instead of seeking help from Philip, applied to Orange and the northern provinces; and in the pacification of Ghent, for the first time, the Netherlands were united in an agreement to expel the Spaniards and to maintain religious toleration. Don John, of Austria, the successor of Requesens, was brought to the point of issuing an edict which conceded the points contained in the Ghent pacification. The rejection of these terms by William of Orange has been considered, by his adversaries, proof positive that ambition, not patriotism, was his ruling motive. But the concessions of Don John involved the exclusion of the public profession of Protestantism from all places where it was not established at the date of the pacification; and, consequently, the banishment from their homes of thousands of peaceful families, as well as the insecurity of the provinces where Protestantism was allowed to continue. More than all, William distrusted the sincerity of Spain, and his suspicions, which had their ground in former experiences of false dealing, were strengthened by information acquired from intercepted letters.[1] It was too late for a reconciliation with Philip. But the Flemish and Brabant nobles were jealous of the eminence conceded to the Prince of Orange. The Union was weakened, and the war broke out again, in which the troops of Don John gained the victory. But the same year, on the 1st of October, 1578, their leader died, wearied with the difficulties of his office, and disheartened by the treatment which he had received at the hands of Philip.

Alexander of Parma, perhaps the ablest general of the time, was next intrusted with the reins of government. Experience had shown the patriotic party that the nobility of the southern provinces were not to be relied on, and, in January, 1579, there

[1] Motley, iii. 106.

was formed, in the North, the Utrecht Union, in which were combined Holland, Zealand, and five other provinces. It was a confederacy for common defense, and was the germ of the Dutch Republic. It was formed "in the name of the King"; but two years afterwards this fiction was dropped, and independence declared. In March, 1580, Philip proclaimed William an outlaw, and set a price on his head. Philip taxed him with ingratitude for the favors which had been bestowed on him by Charles V., charged him with having fomented all heresy and sedition, with having actively countenanced the plundering of the churches and cloisters; in fine, with being responsible for all the miseries of the country. The document further charged him with cherishing jealousy and mistrust, like Cain and Judas, and from the same cause, an evil conscience. Any one who would deliver him, dead or alive, was to receive twenty-five thousand crowns, to have pardon for all offenses, and, in case he belonged to the burgher class, to be elevated to the rank of a nobleman. In response to these accusations, William published his "Apology," or defense. He counted this outlawry and accumulation of charges against him, as the greatest honor, since they showed that he had done all in his power to establish the freedom of a noble nation, and to deliver it from a godless tyranny. He respected Charles V., but the favors which he had received from the Emperor had been returned in full measure by the public services which William had rendered at great cost. To the unfounded aspersions of a personal nature which Philip had interwoven with his indictment, William retorted with accusations equally grave against the private life of the King: Philip had stigmatized him as a foreigner, because he happened to have first seen the light in Germany; but his ancestors were of higher rank than those of Philip, and had held power in the Netherlands for seven generations: Philip had set out to trample under foot the rights and institutions of the country: he talked only of unconditional obedience, as if the people of the Netherlands were Neapolitans, or Milanese, or savage Indians: the Emperor Charles had predicted the evils that would result from the Spanish pride and insolence of his son; but neither the admonition of so great a father, nor justice, nor his oath, could change his nature, or curb his tyrannical will: he had beaten the French by means of William's countrymen, and

owed the treaty of peace, in good part, to William himself; but so far was Philip from feeling any emotion of gratitude, that William, to his amazement, had heard from the lips of Henry II., of Alva's secret conferences with him upon the extermination of all Protestants, in both countries: William, since his boyhood, had given little attention to matters of faith, and of the Church; but, he says, from his compassion for the victims of the Inquisition, and his indignation at the tyranny practiced against his country, he had resolved to exert all his powers to remove the Spaniards out of it, and to suppress the bloody tribunals: he had never approved of the iconoclasm, and similar outbreakings of violence: that he had sufficient reason for flying from the country, was fully evinced by the execution of Egmont and Horn, the carrying of his innocent son, who was a student at Louvain, to Spain, by Philip's order, the confiscation of his property, and the sentence of death pronounced against him. Everywhere, said William, Philip has trodden under foot our rights and broken his oath; we must, therefore, rise in self-defense against him and repel this unparalleled tyranny: as for mistrust, Demosthenes inculcated that as the strongest bulwark against tyranny; and yet the Macedonian Philip was a feeble novice in tyranny compared with the Spanish Philip.

There is no reason to question the sincerity of William's patriotism.[1] His indifference respecting the controverted questions of religion was broken up by the sight of the atrocious cruelties inflicted by the Inquisition upon his countrymen. He examined the questions at issue, and practically, as well as theoretically, embraced the Protestant faith. It is no reproach to him that he early penetrated the character of the gloomy and perfidious ruler who was bent on enslaving the Netherlands to himself and to the Pope; and that he had less and less hope of the practicableness of procuring any amelioration of his policy. But William, in the incipient stages of the conflict, was wisely resolved to keep within the limits of the law, and to avoid extreme and violent measures, so long as this moderation should be possible.[2] If, at the outset of his career, he was not

[1] Writers who would make ambition the moving spring of his character do full justice to his high intellectual powers. See, for example, Bentivoglio, *Della Guerra di Fiandra*, i. 47, iii. 132.

[2] Some candid historians, as Juste and Prescott, find a disagreeable Machia-

free from ambition, his character was more and more purified by danger and suffering. He must be allowed a place among patriots like Epaminondas and Washington, and he deserves to be called the father of a nation. At length, after six ineffectual attempts of the sort, a fanatical Catholic succeeded, on the 18th of July, 1584, in assassinating William. It was characteristic of Philip to pay grudgingly to the heirs of the murderer the promised reward.

Upon the formation of the Utrecht Union, the greater part of the Catholic provinces in the South entered into an arrangement with Parma. Parma granted liberal terms to the cities which, one after another, fell into his hands. Antwerp was promised that its citadel should not be repaired; that a Spanish garrison should not be quartered on the inhabitants. On this one condition the King insisted that the Catholic worship should be restored, and Protestantism be abolished. The utmost that he could be persuaded to grant was that two years should be allowed the inhabitants of every place either to become Catholic or to quit the country. Brabant and Flanders were recovered to Spain.

The archives of Simancas have disclosed the fact, which was not known to Parma himself, in consequence of his death before the execution of the design, that Philip was on the point of removing him from his command. Instigated, perhaps, by jealousy, on the alleged ground that Parma had given too little authority to Spaniards, and for other reasons of even less weight, Philip had actually determined to displace the general who had reconquered for him the southern provinces of the Netherlands, and twice carried his victorious arms into France, forcing Henry IV. to raise the siege of Paris and of Rouen. The King did not shrink from the ingratitude involved in such an act, and from the indignant condemnation which the public opinion of Europe would have pronounced upon it.[1] It was characteristic of Philip to seek the accomplishment of his ends by indirection and falsehood.

vellian element in the shrewdness and reserve of William. To others, this quality does not pass the bounds of a statesmanlike sagacity and a justifiable prudence. Goethe, in his play of "Egmont," makes the Regent say of him: "Oranien sinnt nichts Gutes, seine Gedanken reichen in die Ferne, er ist heimlich," etc.; and Orange says to Egmont: "Ich trage viele Jahre her alle Verhältnisse am Herzen, Ich stehe immer wie über einem Schachspiele und halte keinen Zug des Gegners für unbedeutend." Regarding his life and character see, also, Ruth Putnam, *William the Silent* (1895); and George Edmundson, *Cambridge Modern History*, iii. 190–259.

[1] Gachard, II. lxxxi.

The death of William did not destroy the Republic which he had called into being. In Maurice, his second son — for his eldest son was detained in Spain and brought up to serve the Spanish government — the party of liberty found a head who was possessed of distinguished military ability. The new commonwealth grew in power. The Dutch sailors captured the vessels of Spain on every sea where they appeared, and attacked her remotest colonies. The magnificent schemes of Philip were doomed to an ignominious failure. His despotic system had full sway in Spain, but it brought ruin upon the country. His colossal armada, which was slowly prepared at enormous cost, for the conquest of England, was shattered in pieces. He had planned to turn France into a Spanish province, but he was forced to conclude the peace of Vervins with Henry IV., and thereby to concede the superiority of the French power. Under Philip III., his imbecile successor, Spain was driven to conclude a truce of twelve years with the revolted Netherlands; and finally, in the Peace of Westphalia, was obliged to acknowledge their independence.

The absorbing interest of the great struggle with Spain leaves in the background the distinctively religious and theological side of the Reformation in the Netherlands. Anabaptists were numerous, but their wild and disorganizing theories received a check through the influence of Menno, who, after the year 1536, exerted a wholesome influence among them, organizing churches which he taught and regulated for many years. The Mennonites were free from the licentious and revolutionary principles which had covered the name of Anabaptist with reproach.[1] Apart from their peculiarity respecting baptism, their rejection of oaths, and their refusal to serve in war and in civil offices, together with the ascetic discipline which they adopted — a point on which they became divided among themselves — they were not distinguished from ordinary Protestants. Yet they continued to be confounded with the fanatical Anabaptists, and were objects of a ferocious persecution, which they endured with heroic patience. The Calvinists gradually obtained a decided preponderance over the Lutherans. In 1561 Guido de Bres and a few other ministers composed the "Confessio Bel-

[1] See the articles on Menno and the Mennonites, by Cramer, in Hauck, *Real-encyklopädie*, xii. 594 seq.

gica," which was revised and adopted by a Synod at Antwerp in 1566. This creed differs from the "Confessio Gallica" chiefly in its more full exposition of Baptism, with special reference to the Anabaptist opinions. The Anabaptists are expressly condemned in another Article. The Calvinists sent a copy of their Symbol, with a Letter to the King of Spain, in the vain hope to soften his animosity against them. They say in their Letter that "they were never found in arms or plotting against their sovereign; that the excommunications, imprisonments, banishments, racks, and tortures, and other numberless oppressions which they had undergone, plainly demonstrate that their desires and opinions are not carnal;" "but that having the fear of God before their eyes, and being terrified by the threatening of Christ, who had declared in the Gospel that he would deny them before God the Father, in case they denied him before men, they therefore offered their backs to stripes, their tongues to knives, their mouths to gags, and their whole bodies to the fire." [1]

Yet the Calvinists of the Netherlands, notwithstanding their own dreadful sufferings, did not themselves relinquish the dogma that heresy may be suppressed by the magistrate. Their difference from their opponents was not on the question whether heresy is to be punished, but how heresy is to be defined. This dogma they introduce into the Belgic Confession,[2] and into their Letter to the King. They were disposed, where they had the power, to inflict disabilities and penalties on the Anabaptists, even when they were peaceful subjects. It must not be forgotten that at the very time when Philip's agents were doing their terrible work in the Netherlands, Queen Elizabeth was likewise striving to enforce uniformity in Protestant England. With one hand she helped the Calvinistic subjects of Philip; with the other she thrust her own Puritan subjects into loathsome dungeons. Not that Protestants on either side of the sea were capable of the atrocities for which Philip was responsible. And a difference of degree in the exercise of the inhumanity, which was the fruit of a false principle, is a circumstance of the highest importance. But the principle was at the root the same. Hence the doctrine of religious toleration, which was avowed and practiced by William of Orange and a

[1] Brandt, i. 158. [2] Art. xxxvi., "De Magistratu."

part of his supporters, is the more honorable to them, in contrast with the prevalent intolerance of the age. As early as 1566, in his speech before the Regent and the Council, William denounced persecution as futile, and confirmed his assertion by an appeal to experience, to historical examples, ancient and recent. "Force," he said, "can make no impression on the conscience." He compared inquisitors to physicians who, instead of using mild and gentle medicines, are "for immediately burning or cutting off the infected part." "This is the nature of heresy," he added, "if it rests, it rusts; but he that rubs it, whets it." [1] At a later time, he had to withstand the importunities of his friends, who wished to use force against the Anabaptists. St. Aldegonde reports that to his arguments in behalf of such a measure, his illustrious chief "replied pretty sharply" that the affirmation of the adherents of that sect might take the place of an oath, and that "we ought not to press this matter further, unless we would own at the same time that the Papists were in the right in forcing us to a religion that was incompatible with our consciences." "And upon this occasion," adds St. Aldegonde, "he commended the saying of a monk that was here not long since, who, upon several objections brought against his religion, answered: 'that our pot had not been so long upon the fire as theirs, whom we so much blamed; but that he plainly foresaw that in the course of a pair of hundred years, ecclesiastical dominion would be upon an equal foot in both churches.'" St. Aldegonde himself states that a multitude of nobles and of common people kept away from the Calvinistic assemblies from the fear "of a new tyranny and yoke of spiritual dominion." The Germans, especially, he says, join the heterodox "because they dread our insufferable rigidness." [2] In 1578 the National Synod of all the reformed churches sent up to the Council a petition for religious toleration, which they desired for themselves and pledged to Roman Catholics. "The experience of past years," says the Synod, "had taught them that by reason of their sins they could not all be reduced to one and the same religion;" and that without mutual toleration, they could not throw off the Spanish tyranny.[3] They refer to the rivers of blood that had been shed in France to no purpose, in the effort to procure unanimity in religion.

[1] Brandt, i. 164. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 333. [3] *Ibid.*, i. 340.

There was another question which gave rise to division among the reformed, — the question of the relation of the Church to the civil authority. The Calvinists insisted on their principle of the autonomy of the Church, and rejected ecclesiastical control on the part of the State. As in Geneva and in Scotland, they demanded that the Church should be not separate, but distinct. On the contrary, a great part of the magistrates, and with them an influential portion of the laity, especially such as cared little for the peculiarities of Calvinism as distinguished from Lutheranism, resisted this demand. These claimed that the civil authority should have power in the appointment of ministers and in the administration of Church government. In 1576, under the auspices of William of Orange, a programme of forty ecclesiastical laws was drawn up, in conformity with this principle.[1] The second Synod of Dort, in 1578, endeavored to realize the idea of ecclesiastical autonomy, through a system of presbyteries and of provincial and national synods. But the result of the strife was that the Church was limited to a provincial organization, the provinces being subdivided into classes and each congregation being governed according to the Presbyterian order. The germs of the Arminian controversy are obvious in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. The party which called for full toleration, and were impatient of strict creeds and a rigid discipline, contended, also, for the union of Church and State. The Spanish persecution confirmed the Liberals in the fear that the Church would subject the State to an ecclesiastical tyranny; it confirmed the Calvinists in the fear that the State would subject the Church to a political despotism.

[1] *Ibid.*, i. 318.

CHAPTER X

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND

THERE is reason to believe that the Lollards, as the disciples of Wickliffe were called, were still numerous among the rustic population of England at the beginning of the sixteenth century. We have records of the recantation of some and the burning of other adherents of this sect in the early part of the reign of Henry VIII.[1] When John Knox preached in the north of England and the south of Scotland, he found a cordial reception for his doctrine in districts where the Lollards lived. The revival of learning had also prepared a very different class in English society for ecclesiastical reform. Linguistic and patristic studies had begun to flourish under the influence of Thomas More, Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, and other friends of Erasmus, and under the personal influence of Erasmus himself.[2] Wolsey, whatever may have been his faults, was a liberal patron of learning. He obtained leave to suppress not less than twenty smaller monasteries, and to use their property for the establishment of a noble college, Christ Church, at Oxford, and of another college as a nursery for it, at Ipswich. His fall from power prevented the full accomplishment of the vast educational plans which form his best title to esteem. Wolsey was disinclined to persecution, and preferred to burn heretical books, rather than heretics themselves.[3] Most of the friends of "the new learning" were disposed to remedy ecclesiastical abuses.[4] The writings of Luther early found approving readers, especially among the

[1] Burnet, *History of the Reformation in the Church of England* (ed. 1825, 6 vols.), i. 37. Hallam, *Const. History of England*, ch. ii.

[2] G. Weber, *Geschichte d. Kirchenreformation in Grossbrittanien*, i. 140.

[3] Blunt, *History of the Reformation in England* (from 1514 to 1547), gives an interesting account, and presents a flattering estimate of the services of Wolsey.

[4] See the sketch of Colet's sermon before the Convocation of Canterbury (1572) in Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers of 1498:* also in Blunt, p. 10. Milman, *Annals of St. Paul's*, ch. vi., gives an interesting sketch of Colet's life.

young men at Oxford and Cambridge. The younger generation of Humanists did not stop at the point reached by Colet and More. Tyndale and Frith, both of whom perished as martyrs, and their associates, read the German books with avidity.[1] Tyndale's version of the New Testament was circulated in spite of the efforts of the government to suppress it.[2] It was impossible that the ferment that existed on the Continent should fail to extend itself across the channel. Yet at first the signs were not auspicious for the new doctrine. King Henry VIII. appeared in the lists as an antagonist of Luther, and received from Leo X., in return for his polemical book upon the Sacraments, the title of "Defender of the Faith." [3] Little did either of them imagine that the same monarch would shortly strike one of the heaviest blows at the Papal dominion.

The peculiarity of the English Reformation lies, not in the separation of a political community — in this case a powerful nation — from the papal see; for the same thing took place generally where the Reformation prevailed; but it lies in the fact that it involved immediately so little departure from the dogmatic system of the mediæval Church. At the outset, the creed, and, to a great extent, the polity and ritual, of the Church in England remained intact. Thus in the growth of the English Reformation, there were two factors, the one, in a sense, political; the other, doctrinal or religious. These two agencies might coalesce or might clash with one another. They could not fail to act upon one another with great effect. They moved upon different lines; yet there were certain principal ends, which, from the beginning, they had in common.

Owing to this peculiarity, the leaders of English Reform on the spiritual side did not play the prominent part which was taken by the Reformers in Scotland and on the Continent. In other countries the political adherents of Protestantism were auxiliaries rather than principals. The foreground was occu-

[1] Frith was burned at Smithfield in 1533. Tyndale was strangled and burned near Brussels, in 1536.

[2] Erasmus, in a letter to Luther, speaks of the warm reception of his writings in England. *Erasmi Opera*, iii. 445. Warham, in a letter to Wolsey, under date of March 8, 1521, reports to what extent Lutheran books had found readers at Oxford. Blunt, p. 74.

[3] This title was intended for himself personally, but was retained after his breach with Rome, and transmitted to his successors. Lingard, *History of England*, vi. 90, n.

pied by men like Luther, Calvin, and Knox. In England there were individuals of marked learning, energy, and courage; but to a considerable extent they were cast into the shade by the controlling position which was assumed by rulers and statesmen. The English Reformation, instead of pursuing its course as a religious and intellectual movement, was subject, in an important degree, to the disturbing force of governmental authority, of worldly policy.[1]

Henry VIII. had been married, in his twelfth year, to Catharine of Aragon, the widow of his deceased brother Arthur, and the aunt of the Emperor Charles V. A dispensation had been obtained soon after from Pope Julius II., marriage with a deceased brother's wife being contrary to the canon law. Scruples had been entertained early by some in regard to the validity of the dispensation, and, consequently, of the marriage. Whether Henry himself shared these scruples prior to his acquaintance with Anne Boleyn, it may not be easy to determine. Nor can we say how far his disappointment in not having a male heir to his throne may have prompted him to seek for a divorce. It is not improbable that the death of his children awoke in his mind a superstitious feeling respecting the lawfulness of his connection with Catharine. Yet, according to her solemn testimony, made in his presence, the marriage with Arthur had not been consummated; and if so, the main ground of these alleged misgivings and of the application for the annulling of the marriage had no reality. His application to Clement VII. for the annulling of the marriage, was founded on two grounds: first, that it is not competent for the Pope to grant a dispensation in such a case; and secondly, that it was granted on the basis of erroneous representations. Henry's passion for Anne Boleyn made the delay and vacillation of Clement in regard to the divorce the more unbearable. The Pope might naturally shrink from annulling the act of his predecessor by a decree which would involve, at the same time, a restriction of the papal prerogative. But the real and obvious motive of his procrastinating and evasive conduct was his reluctance to offend Charles V. This temporizing course in one whose exalted office implied a proportionate moral independence was not adapted to increase the loyalty of the King or of his people to the Papacy.

[1] Macaulay, *Review of Hallam* (*Essays*, i. 146).

By the advice of Cranmer, Henry laid the question of the validity of the dispensation before the universities of Europe, resorting, however, to the use of bribery abroad, and of menaces at home. Meantime he proceeded to the adoption of measures for reducing the power of the Pope and of the clergy in England. Jealousy in regard to the wealth and the usurpations of the hierarchical body, which had long been a growing feeling, enlisted the nation in these bold measures. One sign of this feeling was the satisfaction which had been felt at the restraints laid upon the privilege of clerical exemption from responsibility to the civil tribunals. In the preceding reign, a bishop had said that such was the bias of a London jury against the clergy, that it would convict Abel of the murder of Cain. The fall of Wolsey, who was ruined by the failure of the negotiations with Rome for the divorce, and by the enmity of Anne Boleyn, intimidated the whole clerical body, and made them an easy prey to the King's rapacity. "The authority of this Cardinal," says Hall, the old chronicler, "set the clergie in such a pride that they disdained all men, wherefore when he was fallen they followed after." [1] Early in 1531 Henry revived an old statute of Richard II., and accused the clergy of having incurred the penalties of *præmunire* — forfeiture of all movable goods and imprisonment at discretion — for submitting to Wolsey in his character of papal legate. Assembled in convocation, they were obliged to implore his pardon, and obtained it only by handing over a large sum of money. In their petition, he was styled "the Protector and Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England," to which was added, after long debate, the qualifying phrase, "as far as is permitted by the law of Christ." Acts of Parliament took away the first fruits from the Pope, prohibited appeals from ecclesiastical courts to Rome, and, after the consecration of Cranmer, as Archbishop of Canterbury, ordained that henceforward the consecration of all bishops and archbishops should be consummated without application to the Pope. Henry was married to Anne Boleyn on the 25th of March, 1533. On the 14th of the preceding July, at Windsor, for the last time, he saw Catharine who had been his faithful wife for twenty-three years. Eleven weeks after the marriage, the king authorized Cranmer

[1] p. 774.

to decide the question of the divorce without fear or favor! Of course the divorce was decreed. In 1534 the King was required by the Pope to take back Catharine, on penalty of excommunication. On the 9th of June of that year, a royal edict, in turn, abolished the Pope's authority in England. Parliament passed the act of supremacy, "That the King, our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called the Anglicana Ecclesia." This was followed by another great measure for the further humbling of ecclesiastical power — the abolishing of the cloisters and the confiscation of their property — in 1536. This fell, to a great extent, into the hands of the nobles and gentry, and had a powerful effect in linking them to the policy of the king. Subsequently, the larger monasteries, which had been spared at first, shared the fate of the inferior establishments; and, by the expulsion of the mitered abbots from the upper House, the preponderance of power was left with the secular lords.

Thus the kingdom of England was severed from the Papacy, and the Church of England brought into subjection to the civil authority. The old English feeling of dislike of foreign ecclesiastical control had at last ripened into a verification of the words which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of King John, as a message to Pope Innocent III.: —

> "Tell him this tale; and from the mouth of England,
> Add this much more, — that no Italian priest,
> Shall tithe or toll in our dominions;
> But as we under Heaven are supreme head,
> So under him, that great supremacy,
> Where we do reign, we will alone uphold,
> Without the assistance of a mortal hand.
> So tell the Pope: all reverence set apart,
> To him and his usurped authority."[1]

There had been no renunciation of Catholic doctrines. The hierarchy still existed as of old, but with the King in the room of the Pope, as its earthly head. There were two parties side by side in the episcopal offices and in the Council; one of them disposed to move forward to other changes in the direction of Protestantism; the other bent on upholding the ancient creed in its integrity. The Act of Supremacy, as far as it had the sympathy of the people, could not fail to shake their reverence

[1] King John, act iii., sc. i.

for the entire system of which the Papacy had been deemed an essential part, and to incline many to substitute the authority of the Bible for that of the Church; for to the Bible the appeal had been made in the matter of the King's divorce, and the Bible and the constitution of the primitive Church had furnished the grounds for the overthrow of papal supremacy. At the head of the party disposed to reform, among the bishops, was Cranmer, who had spent some time in Germany, and had married for his second wife a niece of a Lutheran theologian, Osiander. Cranmer is well characterized by Ranke as "one of those natures which must have the support of the supreme authority, in order to carry out their own opinions to their consequences; as then they appear enterprising and spirited, so do they become pliant and yielding, when this favor is withdrawn from them; they do not shine by reason of any moral greatness, but they are well adapted to save a cause in difficult circumstances for a more favorable time." [1] Latimer, who became Bishop of Worcester, was made of sterner stuff. Among the other bishops of Protestant tendencies was Edward Fox, who, at Smalcald, had declared the Pope to be Antichrist. The leader of the Protestant party was Thomas Cromwell, who was made the King's Vicegerent in ecclesiastical affairs, who had conducted the visitation of the monasteries which preceded the destruction of them, and was an adherent of the reformed doctrine. On the other side was Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who upheld the King's Supremacy, but was an unbending advocate of the Catholic theology; together with Tunstal of Durham, and other bishops.

The King showed himself, at first, favorable to the Protestant party. The English Bible, which was issued under his authority, and a copy of which was to be placed in every church, had upon the title-page the inscription, issuing from his mouth: "Thy word is a lantern unto my feet." [2] In 1536 ten articles were laid before Convocation, adopted by that body, and

[1] *Englische Geschichte*, i. 204. A severe, not to say harsh, estimate of Cranmer is given by Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, i. 48; *Review of Hallam* (*Essays*, i. 448). "If," says Hallam, "we weigh the character of this prelate in an equal balance, he will appear far indeed removed from the turpitude imputed to him by his enemies; yet not entitled to any extraordinary veneration." *Const. Hist.*, ch. ii. A good recent portrait is that of A. F. Pollard, *Thomas Cranmer* (1904).

[2] On the English versions of the Bible, see Anderson, *Annals of the Engl. Bible* (2 vols. 1845).

sent, by the King's order, to all pastors as a guide for their teaching. The Bible and the three ancient creeds were made the standard of doctrine. Salvation is by faith and without human merits. The sacrament of the altar is defined in terms to which Luther would not have objected. The use of images and various other ceremonies, auricular confession, and the invocation of saints, are approved, but cautions are given against abuses connected with these things. The admission that there is a Purgatory is coupled with the denial of any power in the Pope to deliver souls from it, and with the rejection of other superstitions connected with the old doctrine. These articles, unsatisfactory as they were, in many respects, to the Protestants, were still regarded by them as a long step in the right direction. The Catholic party were offended. A majority of the nation still clung to the ancient religion. The suppression and spoliation of the monasteries, which were prized as dispensers of hospitality and sources of pecuniary advantage to the rustic population, had excited much discontent, especially in the North and West, where the Catholics were most numerous. The disaffection which was heightened by the leaning of the government towards Protestant doctrine, broke out in the rebellion of 1536, which, although it was put down without concessions to the promoters of it, was succeeded by a change in the King's ecclesiastical policy. The Catholic faction gained the ascendency, and, nothwithstanding the opposition of Cranmer and his friends, the Six Articles for "abolishing diversity of opinions" in religion, were framed into a law. These decreed transubstantiation, the needlessness of communion in both kinds, the celibacy of the priesthood, the obligation of vows of chastity, the necessity and value of private masses and of auricular confession. Whoever denied transubstantiation was to be burned at the stake as a heretic. Whoever should publicly attack either of the other articles was to suffer death as a felon, without benefit of clergy. Imprisonment, confiscation of goods, and death were threatened to expressions of dissent from the last five of the articles, according to its form and degree. The execution of Anne Boleyn and the marriage of the King to Jane Seymour (1536); and still more the fall of Cromwell (1540), the great support of the Protestant interest, which followed upon the marriage of Henry to a Protestant princess, Anne of

Cleves, and his immediate divorce, increased the strength of the persecuting faction. Those who denied the King's supremacy and those who denied transubstantiation were dragged on the same hurdle to the place of execution.[1] Earnest bishops, as Latimer and Shaxton, were imprisoned in the Tower. Cranmer was protected by his own prudence and the King's favor.[2]

The death of Henry put an end to this persecution. He had attempted to establish an Anglican Church which should be neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic, but which should differ from the Roman Catholic system only in the article of the Royal Supremacy. His success was remarkable, and has been ascribed correctly to the extraordinary force of his character, the advantageous position of England with reference to foreign powers, the enormous wealth which the confiscation of the religious houses, placed at his disposal and the support of the neutral, undecided class who embraced neither opinion.[3] With the death of Henry, the two parties, as if released from a strong hand, assumed their natural antagonism. The government could maintain its independence of the Papacy only by obtaining the support of the Protestants. Henry, with the assent of Parliament, had determined the order of the succession, giving

[1] The amount of persecution under the Six Articles is discussed by Maitland, *Essays on the Reformation* (London, 1846).

[2] This is not the place to discuss at length the personal character of Henry VIII. Sir James Mackintosh, after recounting the executions of More and Anne, says: "In these two direful deeds Henry approached, perhaps, as nearly to the ideal standard of perfect wickedness as the infirmities of human nature will allow." *History of England*, II. ch. vii. Macaulay pronounces him "a king whose character may be best described by saying that he was despotism itself personified." (*Review of Hallam.*) Burnet gives a milder judgment: "I do not deny that he is to be numbered among the ill princes, yet I cannot rank him with the worst." *Hist. of the Ref.*, i. p. i. b. iii. Lord Herbert, after speaking of his willfulness and jealousy says: "These conditions, again being armed with power, produced such terrible effects as styled him, abroad and at home, by the name of *cruel;* which also hardly can be avoided." *Life and Reign of Henry VIII.*, p. 572. Mr. Froude, in his *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada*, has presented a brilliant apology for Henry VIII. But he fails to offer any adequate defense of the execution of More and of Fisher, an act of cruelty that at the time was reprobated everywhere; and still less for the destruction of Cromwell, whom Froude, whether justly or not, praises up to the very foot of the scaffold. Even if Anne Boleyn be supposed to be guilty of the charges brought against her, there was a brutality in the circumstances of her imprisonment and execution, and in the marriage with Jane Seymour the very next day, which it is impossible to excuse. The contemporaries of Henry were right in distinguishing the earlier from the latter portion of his reign. After the fall of Wolsey, he became more and more willful, suspicious, and cruel.

[3] Macaulay, *History of England*, i. 46.

precedence to Edward, his son by Jane Seymour, over the two princesses, Mary, the daughter of Catharine, and Elizabeth, the daughter of Anne Boleyn. Edward VI. was less than ten years old at his accession in 1547; but as an example of intellectual precocity he has seldom, if ever, been surpassed. He was firmly attached to the Protestant faith. A Regency was established, in which Somerset, the King's uncle, was chief, and at the head of a Protestant majority. The Six Articles were repealed. It was the period of the Smalcaldic war and of the Interim in Germany, and the hands of Cranmer and Ridley were strengthened by theologians from the Continent. Peter Martyr and Ochino were made professors at Oxford in 1547 and Martin Bucer and Paul Fagius were called to Cambridge in 1549. The "Book of Homilies" appeared in 1547 — expositions of Christian doctrine which were to be read by the clergy in their churches every Sunday. Communion had been ordered to be administered in both kinds. Transubstantiation was now formally abandoned; the second principal step, after the declaration of the Royal Supremacy, in the progress of the English Reformation. These changes gave rise to a new "Order of Communion"; but the latter was superseded, in 1548, by the "First Book of Common Prayer." This was commenced by Cranmer five years before, with the consent of Henry, and with the aid of other divines was completed. This liturgy did not exclude the mass without ambiguity; from a wish to avoid too marked traces of change in doctrine. This was revised, in 1552, in Edward's second Book of Common Prayer, prepared by Cranmer, with the assistance of Ridley, when all traces of the mass were effaced, and the use of consecrated oil, prayers for the dead, and auricular confession were abolished. A second Act of Uniformity made this Book the one legal form of worship. In 1552 the Articles were framed, at first forty-two in number. Thus the Anglican Church obtained a definite constitution and a ritual. Able and zealous preachers, among whom were Matthew Parker, Latimer, and John Knox, made many converts to the Protestant doctrine. The progress of innovation, however, was somewhat too rapid for the general sense of the nation. The spoliation of Church property for the profit of individuals, in which Somerset was conspicuous, gave just offense. Anxious to carry out the plan of Henry VIII., for

the marriage of the young Queen Mary of Scotland to Edward, and desirous of uniting the two countries in one great Protestant power, Somerset invaded Scotland; but, though his arms were successful, the antipathy of the Scots to the domination of the English was too strong to be overcome; and Mary was taken to France, there to be married to the Dauphin. A Catholic rebellion in Cornwall and Devonshire was suppressed, but the opposition to Somerset on various grounds, which was led by the Duke of Northumberland, finally brought the Protector to the scaffold; and Northumberland, who was now at the head of affairs, concluded a peace with France, in which the project of a marriage of Edward with Mary was virtually renounced. Under Cranmer's superintendence a revisal of the ecclesiastical statutes, including those for the punishment of heresy, was undertaken; but the work was not finished when the King died, at the age of sixteen (1553).

The reactionary movement that attended the accession of Mary to the throne was heightened by the abortive attempt of Northumberland to deprive her of it by persuading the dying King to bequeath the crown to Lady Jane Grey, a descendant of Henry's sister, and a Protestant, whom Northumberland had married to his son. The party which thus sought to overthrow the order of succession that had been fixed by act of Parliament, found that it was feebly supported, soon became divided, and effected nothing. The insurrection under Wyat was punished by the death of its leaders, and led to the execution of Lady Jane Grey. Mary was narrow, with the obstinate will of her father, and superstitiously attached to the religion of her mother. She proceeded as expeditiously as her more prudent advisers — of whom Philip of Spain was the chief — would permit, to restore the Catholic system. She soon dislodged the married clergy from their places. The Prayer Book was abolished. Disdaining the suggestion that she should marry an Englishman, she gave her hand to Philip with a devotion in which zeal for the Catholic faith was indistinguishably mingled with personal regard. The point on which Parliament showed most hesitation was the matter of the Supremacy. The opposition to papal control was more general and better established than the antagonism to Roman Catholic doctrine. Parliament insisted that the guarantee of the abbey lands to their new pos-

sessors should be incorporated in the very act which reëstablished papal authority. Reginald Pole, who was made legate of the Pope in 1554, and succeeded Cranmer in the archbishopric, was the Queen's spiritual counselor. The fourth of the great measures for the destruction of Protestantism was the enforcement of the laws against heresy. Gardiner lost no time in abandoning the doctrine of the King's supremacy, which it is difficult to believe that he ever sincerely held. He and Bonner, the new Bishop of London, were active in persecution. The foreign theologians were driven out of the kingdom, and the foreign congregations dispersed. Not less than eight hundred Englishmen, whose lives were in danger at home, found an asylum among their brethren in Germany and Switzerland. The noble fortitude with which Hooper, Latimer, Ridley, and numerous other martyrs endured the fire, did much to strengthen the Protestant cause and to break down the popularity of Mary. Cranmer, from the day when he saw from his prison tower the burning of his companions, Ridley and Latimer, seems to have lost his spirit. He was persuaded to make an abject recantation; but, notwithstanding this act, it was determined that he should die. What course he would have pursued had he been permitted to live, it is impossible to tell; but, in the prospect of certain death, his courage revived, and he exhibited at the end a dignity and constancy which have gone far in the estimation of posterity to atone for his previous infirmities. The fault of Cranmer was a time-serving spirit; an undue subservience to power; a timidity, which is not compatible with the highest type of manly honesty. An example of this is seen in the course he adopted on taking the oaths of canonical obedience to the Pope, at his consecration as Archbishop; when he satisfied his conscience by a protest to the effect that he did not consider himself bound to abstain from measures for the reformation of the Church,[1] and (on April 19) renounced all grants from the Pope that might be prejudicial to the King. His participation in the condemnation of John Frith, who was burned at Smithfield in 1533 for denying the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament; and still more, his part in the execution of Jean Boucher, or Joan of Kent, who was called an

[1] This protestation was not communicated to the Pope. See Hallam's remarks upon it, *Const. Hist.*, ch. ii. (Harpers' Am. ed., pp. 65, 66 and n.).

Anabaptist, and was burned, in the reign of Edward, for an heretical opinion respecting the Incarnation — not to speak of other examples of a like intolerance — are a blot upon his memory. In the last days of Edward, Cranmer and his associates were engaged in shaping laws for the punishment of believers in doctrines which he had himself held not long before, and for disbelieving in which he had assisted in bringing Frith and others to the stake. The Protestant bishops, says Lingard, the Catholic historian, "perished in flames which they had prepared for their adversaries." [1] Yet Cranmer, as Burnet has justly said, was instigated by no cruelty of temper. He was under the sway of the idea that there must be uniformity, and that the magistrate must be responsible for securing it. This idea it was, in connection with the pliant disposition which belonged to him by nature, that moved him, in the last years of Henry VIII., to an unjustifiable concealment or compromise of his opinions. It must be set down to his credit that he raised his voice against the adoption of the Six Articles, and interceded, when intercession, in however cautious a form, was hazardous, for the lives of Anne Boleyn and Cromwell. But the burning of a man of his venerable age, who had filled so large a space in the public eye, whose hand had been pressed by Henry VIII. when he was dying, and whose own death took place under circumstances so affecting, could not fail to react to the disadvantage of the Queen and of her creed. Various other causes conspired to render her unpopular. In 1555 Paul IV., a violent bigot, and withal hostile to the Spanish-Austrian House, became Pope. He insisted on a restoration of the Church property in England. He would have the ruined monasteries once more tenanted by the monks. That is to say, he was resolved to annul the condition on which alone Parliament had consented to restore the papal supremacy. Moreover, England was brought, through Philip, to take part in the war of Spain against France, which gave the victory of St. Quentin to the Spanish king, but made the English smart under the loss of Calais. The Queen, whose whole soul was bound up with the cause of the Catholic Church and who looked upon Philip as its champion, was forced to witness the hostility of

[1] This is somewhat too severe, as the temporal penalties of heresy were to be fixed by Parliament. See Hallam, *Const. Hist. of England* (later editions), ch. ii.

the Pope to her husband, and to see Pole, who belonged to that section of the Catholics which was inclined to Protestant views of justification, and for this reason was disliked by Paul IV., deprived of the legatine office. To add to the perils of the situation, France was in alliance with Scotland. Mary died on the 17th of November, 1558. The next night, Cardinal Pole died. It is remarkable that within a short time before or after the Queen's death, not less than thirteen of her bishops died also.

The nation welcomed Elizabeth to the throne. Her bias, which resulted from her education and her native habit of feeling, was towards a highly conservative Protestantism. The point to which she was irrevocably attached was that of the sovereign's supremacy. Her own legitimacy and title to the throne depended on it, and her natural love of power confirmed her attachment to it. She did not reject the Protestant doctrines respecting gratuitous salvation and the supreme authority of the Scriptures, but she was disposed to retain as much as possible of the ancient ritual. She had a decided repugnance to the marriage of the clergy, and was with difficulty dissuaded from absolutely forbidding it. She kept on the altar of her own private chapel a crucifix and a burning candle. On her accession, she is said to have notified Paul IV. of the fact; but this fanatical prelate haughtily replied that she must submit her claims to his decision. At a later day, when Pius IV. offered to make important concessions, such as the granting of the cup to the laity and the use of the English Liturgy, the proposal was refused. In the revision of the Liturgy, the passage in the Litany relative to the "tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities" was omitted, as well as the explanation of the rubric that by kneeling in the Sacrament no adoration is intended for any corporal presence of Christ. The Forty-two Articles were reduced to Thirty-nine, in the revision by Convocation in 1563; and its act was confirmed by Parliament in 1571. The Act of Supremacy placed ecclesiastical power in the hands of the Queen, and the Act of Uniformity made dissent in public teaching and in the ceremonies of worship unlawful. A Court of High Commission was established and furnished with ample powers for enforcing uniformity, and suppressing and punishing heresy and dissent.

The two classes of subjects against whom these powers were to be exerted were the Catholics and the party which was growing up under the name of Puritans. That the persecution to which Catholics were subject during this reign was palliated, and that the severe proceedings against them were in some cases justified, by the political hostility which was often inseparably mingled with their religious faith, is true. When the Protestantism of the Queen was made the ground of attack upon her on the part of foreign powers, and of conspiracies against her life; when at length she was deposed by a bull of Pius V., and her subjects released from their allegiance, it was natural that severity should be used towards that portion of her subjects who were looked upon as the natural allies of her enemies. Yet it is likewise true that repressive measures were adopted against the Catholics in many cases where justice as well as sound policy would have dictated a different course.

A consideration of the general character of the Anglican Church, as that was determined after the accession of Elizabeth, will qualify us to understand the Puritan controversy. The feature that distinguished the English Church from the reformed churches on the Continent was the retention in its polity and worship of so much that had belonged to the Catholic system. The first step in the English Reformation was the assertion of the Royal Supremacy. At the beginning this meant a declaration of the nation's independence of Rome. But the positive character of this supremacy was not clearly defined. In the time of Henry VIII., and in the beginning of Edward's reign, Cranmer and the bishops, like civil officers, held their commissions at the King's pleasure. On the death of Henry, Cranmer considered the archbishopric of Canterbury vacant until he should be supplied with a new appointment. As the head of the Church, the King could make and deprive bishops, as he could appoint and degrade all other officers in the kingdom. The episcopal polity was retained, partly because the bishops generally fell in with the proceedings of Henry VIII. and Edward for the reform of the Church, and on account of the compact organization of the monarchy, in consequence of which the nation acted as one body. But in the first age of the Reformation, and until the rise of Puritanism as a distinct party, there was little controversy among Protestants in relation to

episcopacy. Not only was Melancthon willing to allow bishops with a *jure humano* authority, but Luther and Calvin were also of the same mind. The episcopal constitution of the English Church for a long period put no barrier in the way of the most free and fraternal relations between that body and the Protestant churches on the Continent. As we have seen, Cranmer placed foreign divines in very responsible places in the English Church. Ministers who had received Presbyterian ordination were admitted to take charge of English parishes without a question as to the validity of their orders. We find Cranmer, Melancthon, and Calvin more than once in correspondence with one another, in regard to the calling of a general Protestant Council, to counteract the influence of Trent. The great English divines were in constant correspondence with the Helvetic reformers, to whom they looked for counsel and sympathy, and whom they addressed in a deferential and affectionate style. The pastors of Zurich, Bullinger the successor, and Gualter, the son-in-law of Zwingli, were their intimate and trusted advisers. It was a common opinion that there is a parity between bishops and presbyters; that the difference is one of office and not of order. This had been a prevailing view among the schoolmen in the Middle Ages. Though it belonged to bishops to ordain and (in the Latin Church) to confirm; yet the priest, not less than the bishop, performed the miracle of the Eucharist, the highest clerical act. Cranmer distinctly asserted the parity of the two classes of clergy. The same thing is found in the "Bishops' Book," or *Institution of a Christian Man*, which was put forth by authority in 1537.[1] But Cranmer has left on record an explicit assertion of his opinion.[2] Jewel, one of the great lights of the

[1] Burnet, i. 468 (Addenda). Burnet says that it was "the common style of that age" — derived from the schoolmen — "to reckon bishops and priests as the same office." After the Tridentine Council, the doctrine of the *institutio divina* of bishops prevailed in the Catholic Church. See Gieseler, I. i. 2. § 30, n. i.

[2] See Burnet, I. (ii.) Collection of Records, xxi. *The Resolutions of several Bishops and Divines, of some Questions concerning the Sacraments*, etc. "Question 10. Whether bishops or priests were first? and if the priests first, then the priests made the bishop." Cranmer answers: "The bishops and priests were at one time, and were no two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion." "Question 12. Whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of bishop or priests, or only appointing to the office be sufficient?" Cranmer answers: "In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a bishop or priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient." In answer to question 14, Cranmer says that "it is not

English Church in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth, appears to hold this view. Bancroft, the successor of Whitgift as Archbishop of Canterbury, is thought to have been the first to maintain the necessity of bishops, or the *jure divino* doctrine.[1] There is no trace of such a doctrine in the "Apology for the Church of England," and in the "Defense of the Apology," by Jewel, which have been regarded by Anglicans with just pride as an able refutation of Roman Catholic accusations against their system. At a much later time, Lord Bacon, in his "Advertisement concerning Controversies of the Church of England," speaks of the stiff defenders of all the orders of the Church, as beginning to condemn their opponents as "a sect." "Yea, and some indiscreet persons have been bold in open preaching to use dishonorable and derogatory speech and censure of the churches abroad; and that so far, as some of our men, as I have heard, ordained in foreign parts, have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers. Thus we see the beginnings were modest, but the extremes were violent." [2] Near the end of Elizabeth's reign, Hooker, in his celebrated work in defense of the Church of England, fully concedes the validity of Presbyterian ordination; with tacit reference, as Keble, his modern editor, concedes, to the continental Churches. Laud was reproved in 1604 for maintaining in his exercise for Bachelor of Divinity at Oxford that there could be no true church without bishops; "which was thought to cast a bone of contention between the Church of England and the Reformed on the Continent." Even as late as 1618, in the reign of James I., an English bishop and several Anglican clergymen sat in the Synod of Dort, with a presbyter for its moderator.

The Anglican Church agreed with the Protestant churches

forbidden by God's law," if all the bishops and priests in a region were dead, that "the King of that region should make bishops and priests to supply the same." See also a *Declaration* signed by Cranmer and other bishops, with Cromwell. Burnet, *Ibid. Addenda V.* After describing in full the functions of the clergy, it is said: "This office, this power and authority, was committed and given by Christ and his Apostles unto certain persons only, that is to say, unto priests or bishops, whom they did elect, call, and admit thereunto by their prayers and imposition of hands." "The truth is that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinctions in orders, but only of deacons or ministers, and of priests or bishops." Thirteen bishops, with a great number of other ecclesiastics, subscribed to this proposition.

[1] Hallam thinks that not even Bancroft taught this view, where it is supposed by many to be found, in his sermon at St. Paul's Cross (1589). *Const. Hist.*, p. 226 (Harpers' Am. ed.).

[2] *Works* (Montagu's ed.), vii. 48.

on the Continent on the subject of predestination. On this subject, for a long period, the Protestants generally were united in opinion. They adopted the Augustinian tenet. The impotency of the will is affirmed by Luther as strongly as by Calvin. Melancthon's gradual modification of the doctrine, which allowed to the will a coöperative agency in conversion, only affected a portion of the Lutheran Church. The leaders of the English Reformation, from the time when the death of Henry VIII. placed them firmly upon Protestant ground, profess the doctrine of absolute, as distinguished from conditional, predestination, which is the essential feature of both the Augustinian and Calvinistic systems. It is true that Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer have not left so definite expressions on this subject in their writings as is the case with the Elizabethan bishops. But the seventeenth of the Articles cannot fairly be interpreted in any other sense than that of unconditional election; and the cautions which are appended, instead of being opposed to this interpretation, demonstrate the correctness of it; for who was ever "thrust into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living," by the opposite doctrine?[1] Bradford when in prison in London disputed on this subject with certain "free willers," of whom he wrote to his fellow-martyrs then at Oxford. Ridley's letter in reply certainly implies sympathy with his friend in this opinion.[2] Strype says that Ridley and Bradford wrote on predestination, and that Bradford's treatise was approved by Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer. The relations of Cranmer to Bucer and Peter Martyr throw light on his opinion relative to this question. Bucer, before he was called to England, had dedicated his exposition of the Romans, in which he sets forth the doctrine of absolute predestination, to Cranmer. Peter Martyr elaborately defended

[1] It is important to observe, that in the inquiry whether the Articles are "Calvinistic" or not, this term is used in contradistinction to Arminian. Among the writers in defense of their non-Calvinistic character is Archbishop Lawrence, *Bampton Lectures* (1804). On the same side, with some hesitation, is Bishop Harald Browne, who reviews the controversy. *An Exposit. of the xxxix. Articles* (1858). Bishop Burnet, himself a Latitudinarian, in his dispassionate discussion of the subject, says: "It is not to be denied that the Article [xvii.] seems to be framed according to St. Austin's doctrine." "It is very probable that those who penned it meant that the decree is absolute." *Exposition of the xxxix. Articles* (Art. xvii.).

[2] The moderation of Ridley is indicated in the remark that he dares not write otherwise on this subject "than the very text doth, as it were, lead me by the hand." *Works* (Parker Soc.), p. 368.

this tenet at Oxford, and replied to the anti-Calvinistic treatises of Smith, his predecessor, and of Pighius, the opponent of Calvin. It was during the residence of Martyr at Oxford that the Articles were framed.[1] On the accession of Mary, Cranmer offered to defend, in conjunction with his friend Martyr, in a public disputation, the doctrines which had been established in the previous reign. It is impossible to believe that they materially differed on this prominent point of theological belief.[2] There is more ground for the assertion that the formularies of the Church of England are Augustinian, in distinction from Calvinistic.[3] Yet it is admitted by candid scholars that at the

[1] "In das, von der Londoner Synode im Jahr 1552, aufgefasste Glaubensbekenntniss der Englischen Kirche, wurden die Lehre von der Erbsünde, der Praedestination, und der Rechtfertigung, aufgenommen, so wie Martyr, und mit ihm alle gleichzeitigen protestantischen Theologen in England sie aufgestellt hatten." Dr. C. Schmidt, *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Leben u. ausgewählte Schriften*, p. 117.

[2] Upon the Calvinism of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, see Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, i. 33. Hunt refers to Cranmer's notes on the Great Bible as settling the point that he was a "moderate Calvinist."

[3] The particulars in which Calvin varied from Augustine are these. Augustine made the fall of Adam, the first sin, the object of a permissive decree. Calvin was not satisfied with a bare, passive permission on the part of God, and makes statements which tend to the supralapsarian idea. (See *supra*, p. 177.) This view was developed by Beza and a section of the Calvinists. But infralapsarian or Augustinian Calvinism has had the suffrages of a majority. It is found in the Westminster Confession, and even the creed of the Synod of Dort does not go beyond it. Augustine held to the præterition, instead of the reprobation of the wicked; or rather to their reprobation, not to sin, but to the punishment of sin. (For the passages see Münscher, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 402.) High Calvinists held to a positive decree of reprobation, analogous to that of election; yet denied that God is the author of sin. Calvin differed from Augustine in holding to the perseverance of all believers; that is, that none but the elect ever exercise saving faith. Augustine attributed to the sacraments a greater effect on the non-elect. Thus he held that all baptized infants are saved. This sacramental tenet is often declared to be a feature of the Anglican system, as opposed to that of Calvin. (See, *e.g.*, Blunt, *Dict. of Doctr. and Hist. Theol.*, p. 103.) But Calvin teaches, not indeed that a saving measure of grace is given to all baptized children; but still that all such are "engrafted into the body of the church," "accepted as His [God's] children by the solemn symbol of adoption," and that "God has his different degrees of regenerating those whom He has adopted." *Inst.*, iv. xvi. 9, 31. He teaches that grace is imparted, to some extent, to non-elect adults, who are thus rendered more inexcusable. The *ex opere operato* theory of the sacraments, the theory of their intrinsic efficiency, independently of the feeling of the recipient, is denied— in the xiii. Articles, expressly— and "the wholesome effect or operation" of them is confined "to such only as worthily receive the same." Article xvii. affirms that "we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture." This is sometimes said to be anti-Calvinistic. But Calvin says that " the voice of the gospel addresses all men generally," and that " the promises are offered equally to the faithful and the impious." *Inst.*, iii. xxii. 10, and ii. v. 10. The Article implies the Calvinistic or Augustinian distinction between the " secret will," or purpose, and " that will of God " which is expressly declared.

beginning of Elizabeth's reign "Calvinistic teaching generally prevailed." [1] But through the whole reign of Edward, also, Calvin's personal influence was great in England. His controversy with Pighius, and the expulsion of Bolsec from Geneva, in 1551, excited general attention. It was about this time that election and kindred topics began to be agitated in England. Under date of September 10, 1552, Bartholomew Traheron wrote to Bullinger: "I am exceedingly desirous to know what you and the other very learned men, who live at Zurich, think respecting the predestination and Providence of God." "The greater number among us, of whom I own myself to be one, embrace the opinion of John Calvin as being perspicuous, and most agreeable to Holy Scripture. And we truly thank God that that excellent treatise of the very learned and excellent John Calvin against Pighius and one Georgius Siculus should have come forth at the very time when the question began to be agitated among us. For we confess that he has thrown much light upon the subject, or rather so handled it as that we have never before seen anything more learned or more plain." [2] At this time, as Bullinger indicates by his reply, even he was not satisfied with the supralapsarian tenet, the modification of Augustinism, which Calvin had broached; the theory that the first sin is the object of an efficient decree.[3] After the accession of Elizabeth, the Institutes of Calvin "were generally in the hands of the clergy, and might be considered their text-book of theology." [4]

But while it is true that the Anglican divines of the sixteenth century may be said to be Calvinistic in their opinion respecting the divine decrees, it is also true that they were, as a rule, not rigid in the profession and maintenance of this dogma. On

[1] Blunt, *Dict. of Doctr. and Historical Theol.*, and "Calvinism," p. 105.

[2] *Original Letters*, p. 325.

[3] After Peter Martyr took up his residence at Zurich (in 1556), Bullinger went further than before in his assertion of predestination. See Herzog, *Real-Encycl.*, art. "Bullinger."

[4] Blunt, *ut supra*. We find explicit proofs that Jewel, Nowell, Sandys, Cox, professed to concur with the Reformers of Zurich and Geneva in every point of doctrine. Hallam, *Const. Hist.*, ch. vii. Archbishop Grindal (then Bishop of London), writing June 6, 1562, says, in reference to certain Lutherans at Bremen: "It is astonishing that they are raising such commotions about predestination. They should at least consult their own Luther on the 'bondage of the will.' For what else do Bucer, Calvin, and Martyr teach, that Luther has not maintained in that treatise?" (*Zurich Letters*, 2d ed., p. 142.) It was considered that these leading Reformers were substantially united on this subject.

this topic, they shared in the prevailing belief of the Protestants of that age. But they combined in their theology other elements which stood out in more distinct relief. And the tendency to go back to antiquity, to seek for moderate, and to avoid obnoxious, conceptions of doctrine; in a word, the peculiar spirit fostered by the whole Anglican system, tended more and more to blunt the sharpness of doctrinal statements on this subject. The contrast is marked, in this particular, between Whitgift, a strenuous Calvinist, and Hooker, who approved, in general, of the Calvinistic system, but represents in his whole tone the school of distinctively Anglican theologians which was acquiring an increasing strength.[1] As late as 1595, the Lambeth Articles, containing the strongest assertion of unconditional election, and of reprobation also, were subscribed by Whitgift, then Archbishop of Canterbury, by the bishops of London and Bangor, and with slight verbal amendments, by the Archbishop of York, and transmitted by Whitgift to the University of Cambridge; these Articles being, he said, an explication of the doctrine of the Church of England.[2] At this time dissent from Calvinism had begun distinctly to manifest itself; and gradually the Arminian doctrine spread in England until, during the next reign, it became prevalent in the established Church.

The great and almost the only topic of doctrinal controversy among Protestants in the early stages of the Reformation was the Lord's Supper. On this subject, the Church of England allied itself to the Reformed or Calvinistic branch of the Protestant family. It must be remembered that Bucer and Calvin had struck out a middle path between the Lutheran idea of the

[1] Hooker, in the copious Preface to his Treatise, lauds Calvin, whom he pronounces "incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy, since the hour it enjoyed him." He praises Calvin's "Institutes" and Commentaries, and has no contest with his doctrinal system. At the same time, Hooker's work is tinged throughout with the characteristics of the Anglican school. Principal Tulloch has interesting remarks on what he terms "the comprehensiveness and genial width of view" of the Anglican Calvinists, such as Jewel and Hooker. *English Puritanism and its Leaders*, pp. 5, 7, 41.

[2] The Lambeth Articles may be found in Neal, *History of the Puritans*, i. 209, and in Cardwell, *History of the Articles* (App. v.), p. 343. Cardwell prints the Articles, both as written by Whitaker and as subscribed. If Art v. asserts perseverance in the exercising of true and justifying faith of the elect only, Art. vi. affirms that all who are possessed of this faith have a full assurance and certainty of their everlasting salvation. The Articles of the Episcopal Church adopted in Ireland in 1615 were decidedly Calvinistic. Archbishop Usher, who became Primate of the Irish Church in 1624, was a most learned advocate of this type of theology.

local presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, and the idea of a mere commemoration, which was the original view of Zwingli. This middle doctrine denied the Lutheran hypothesis of the ubiquity of Christ's body, asserted that it is now confined to heaven, but at the same time affirmed a real, though mysterious and purely spiritual reception of Christ by believers alone, by virtue of which a vitalizing power is communicated to the recipient, even from His body. With this hypothesis of a real, but spiritual presence and reception of Christ, the Zwinglians were satisfied. Even Zwingli and Œcolampadius were not disposed to contend against it; and it formed the basis of union between Calvin and his followers, and the Zwinglian Churches. At the outset, after giving up transubstantiation, Cranmer adopted the Lutheran doctrine of "consubstantiation"; but Ridley embraced the Swiss doctrine, in its later form, and Cranmer declared himself of the same mind. On the 31st of December, 1548, Bartholomew Traheron writes to Bullinger of the Disputation which had just been held in London, on the Eucharist, "in the presence of almost all the nobility of England." He says: "the Archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly, and learnedly maintained your opinion upon this subject. His arguments were as follows: The body of Christ was taken up from us into heaven. Christ has left the world. 'Ye have the poor always with you, but me ye have not always,' etc. Next followed the Bishop of Rochester" [Ridley]. "The truth never obtained a more brilliant victory among us" — that is, in conflict with the Papists. "I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters, have altogether come over to our side." [1] The exiles who fled

[1] Cranmer himself says, referring to his translation, in the first year of Edward, of the Lutheran Catechism of Justus Jonas, in which it is affirmed that the body and blood of the Saviour are received by the mouth: "Not long before I wrote the said Catechism, I was in that error of the real presence, as I was many years past, in divers other errors, as transubstantiation" — here he enumerates other papal doctrines which he had once held. Cranmer, *Treatises on the Lord's Supper* (Parker Soc.), p. 374. In the discussions respecting the Sacrament prior to the preparation of the XLII. Articles of 1553, Bucer thought Martyr too Zwinglian. See C. Schmidt, *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Leben u. ausgewählte Schriften*, p. 103 seq.; Baum, *Capito u. Bucer, Leben*, etc., p. 555; Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, p. 96. But this led to no serious disagreement. Bucer and Martyr were both substantially Calvinistic. The idea that Cranmer was disinclined to the "Swiss doctrine" is contradicted by his own words: "Bucer dissenteth in nothing from Œcolampadius and Zwinglius," *The Lord's Supper*

from England on the death of Edward were inhospitably received in Germany on account of their Calvinism. In 1562, after the readoption of the Articles under Elizabeth, Jewel wrote to Peter Martyr: "As for matters of doctrine, we have pared everything away to the quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth; for as to the ubiquitarian theory" — the Lutheran view — "there is no danger in this country. Opinions of that kind can only gain admittance where the stones have sense." [1] But there is no need of bringing forward further evidence on this point, since the Articles explicitly assert the Calvinistic view. In speaking of the English Reformers as Calvinistic, it is not implied that they derived their opinions from Calvin exclusively, or received them on his authority. They were able and learned men, and explored the Scriptures and the patristic writers for themselves. Yet no name was held in higher honor among them than that of the Genevan Reformer.

A controversy of greater moment for the subsequent ecclesiastical as well as political history of England was that between the Anglicans and Puritans. From the beginning, there were some in England who wished to introduce more radical changes and to conform the English Reformation to the type which it had reached among the Reformed or Calvinistic Churches on the Continent. This disposition gained force through the residence of the foreign divines in England in the time of Edward, and still more by the return of the exiles after the accession of Elizabeth. The great obstacles in the way of obtaining the changes which they desired were the strength of the Catholic party and the conservatism of Queen Elizabeth. The controversy first had respect to the use of the vestments, especially the cap and surplice, and extended to other peculiarities of the ritual. The ground of the Puritan objection was that these things were identified in the popular mind with the papal notion

(Parker Soc.), p. 225. The changes in the Order of Communion, in the Revision of 1552, are Zwinglian in their tone. See Cardwell, *History of Conferences and Other Proceedings connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 4, 5. King Edward's Catechism for all schoolmasters to teach is definitely anti-Lutheran. The commemorative side of the Eucharist is emphasized. Faith is described as the mouth of the spirit for receiving Christ. See *Liturgies of King Edward* (Parker Soc.), pp. 516, 517. Bishop Coverdale, the friend of Cranmer, translated a writing of Calvin on the Sacrament.

[1] February 7, 1562. Zurich Letters (2d series), p. 124.

of a particular priesthood. They were badges of popery, and for this reason should be discarded. When it was replied that the surplice, the cross in baptism, kneeling at the Sacrament, are things indifferent in their nature, the rejoinder was made that since they are misleading in their influence, they are not indifferent, in the moral sense, but that if they are indifferent, the magistrate has no right to impose them upon Christian people: it is an infringement of Christian liberty. In this last affirmation was involved an idea with regard to the Supremacy which must lead to a difference of a more radical character. Hooper, who is often styled the father of the Puritans, had spent some time at Zurich while the Adiaphoristic controversy, which related to the same subject of ceremonies, was raging in Germany. Being chosen under Edward, in 1550, to the bishopric of Gloucester, he refused to wear the vestments at his consecration. Finally, after he had been imprisoned, the difficulty was settled by a compromise. They were, in fact, very much laid aside during this reign. At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign there was a general feeling among her newly appointed bishops, most of whom had been abroad during the persecutions under Mary, in favor of the disuse of the vestments and of the offensive ceremonies. This was the wish of Jewel, of Nowell, of Sandys, afterwards Archbishop of York, of Grindal, who succeeded Parker in the archbishopric of Canterbury. Only Cox, the Bishop of Ely, who, in the church of the exiles at Frankfort, had led the party which clung to the English Liturgy, and Parker, who had remained in England during the late reign, were on the other side; although Parker appears, at the outset, to have looked with doubt or disfavor upon the vestments.[1] Burleigh, Walsingham, Leicester, were in favor of giving them up, or of not making their use compulsory. English prelates, in their correspondence, speak of them in the same terms of derision and contempt as the Puritan leaders afterwards employed. For example, Jewel says in one of his letters to Peter Martyr: "Now that the full light of the Gospel has shone forth, the very vestiges of error must, as far as possible, be removed, together with the rubbish, and, as the saying is, with the very dust. And I wish we could effect this in respect to that linen surplice." The statements of Macaulay are sus-

[1] Short, *History of the Church of England*, p. 250.

tained by the correspondence of the English with the Swiss Reformers, and by other evidence: "The English Reformers were eager to go as far as their brethren on the Continent. They unanimously condemned as anti-Christian numerous dogmas and practices to which Henry had stubbornly adhered and which Elizabeth reluctantly abandoned. Many felt a strong repugnance even to things indifferent which had formed part of the polity or ritual of the 'mystical Babylon.' Thus Bishop Hooper, who died manfully at Gloucester for his religion, long refused to wear the episcopal vestments. Bishop Ridley, a martyr of still greater renown, pulled down the ancient altars of his diocese, and ordered the Eucharist to be administered in the middle of churches, at tables which the Papists irreverently termed oyster boards. Bishop Jewel pronounced the clerical garb to be a stage dress, a fool's coat, a relic of the Amorites, and promised that he would spare no labor to extirpate such degrading absurdities. Archbishop Grindal long hesitated about accepting a miter, from dislike of what he regarded as the mummery of consecration. Bishop Parkhurst uttered a fervent prayer that the Church of England would propose to herself the Church of Zurich as the absolute pattern of a Christian community."[1] But the Queen, to whom the Royal Supremacy was the most valuable part of Protestantism, was inflexibly opposed to the proposed changes. Not without difficulty did the new bishops succeed in procuring the removal of images from the churches. The great fear of the Protestant leaders was that the Queen would be driven over to the Catholic Church, in case they undertook to withstand her wishes. Most of the eminent foreign divines on the Continent, whom they

[1] *History of England*, i. 47. Strype says that when Grindal was appointed Bishop of London, he "remained under some scruples of conscience about some things; especially the habits and certain ceremonies required to be used of such as were bishops. For the Reformed in these times generally went upon the ground, that, in order to the complete freeing of the Church of Christ from the errors and corruptions of Rome, every usage and custom practiced by that apostate and idolatrous Church should be abolished, and that the service of God should be most simple, stript of all that show, pomp, and appearance, that has been customarily used before, esteeming all that to be no better than superstitious and anti-Christian." *Life of Grindal*, p. 28. In the reign of Edward, Martin Bucer, writing under Cranmer's roof at Lambeth, under date of April 26, 1549, speaks of the retention of the vestments, chrism, etc., in the Anglican ritual, and says, "They affirm that there is no superstition in these things, and that they are only to be retained for a time, lest the people, not having yet learned Christ, should be deterred by too extensive innovations from embracing His religion," etc. *Original Letters*, ii. 535.

consulted, counseled them to remain in the Church, and not desert their offices, but to labor patiently to effect the reforms to which the Queen would not then consent. But many of the clergy did not conform to the obnoxious parts of the ritual. This occasioned much disorder in worship, and, as the Puritans were not at all disposed to follow their own ways in silence, it gave rise also to much contention. The Queen resolved to enforce uniformity, and required her bishops, especially Parker, to prosecute the delinquents. At length, the Puritans began to organize in separate conventicles, as their meetings were styled by their adversaries, in order to worship according to the method which they approved. They mere numerous; their clergy were learned and effective preachers, and both clergy and people were willing to suffer for the sake of conscience. The cruel, but ineffectual, persecution of them, darkens the reign of Elizabeth, especially the latter part of it. Among the other ends for which the Puritans were always zealous, were stricter discipline in the Church, and an educated, earnest ministry, to take the place of the thousands of notoriously incompetent clergymen.[1]

If Hooper was the parent of Puritanism in its incipient form, a like relation to Puritanism, as a ripe and developed system, belongs to Thomas Cartwright, Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. About the year 1570, he began to set forth the principles respecting the polity of the Church and the proper relation of the Church to the State, which formed the creed of the body of the Puritan party afterwards. The first point in his system is that the Scriptures are not only the rule of faith, but also the rule for the government and discipline of the Church. They present a scheme of polity from which the Church is not at liberty to depart. The second point is that the management of Church affairs belongs to the Church itself and its officers, and not to civil magistrates. Cartwright held to the old view of the distinction between ecclesiastical and civil society. While the magistrate may not dictate to the Church in matters pertaining to doctrine and discipline, still he is bound to protect and defend the Church, and see that its decrees are executed. Cartwright was no advocate of

[1] The objections of the Puritans to the Anglican Ritual are stated and explained by Neal, *History of the Puritans*, I. ch. v.

toleration. In his system, Church and State are indissolubly linked, and there must be uniformity in religion. But what that system of religion and worship shall be, which it belongs to the magistrate to maintain, it is for the Church in its own assemblies, and not for him to decide. Moreover, Cartwright contended that the system of polity which the Scriptures ordain is the Presbyterian, and that prelacy, therefore, is unlawful.

This was, of course, a blow at the Queen's Supremacy, as it had been understood and exercised. It is true that Elizabeth disclaimed the title of Head of the Church and called herself its Governor. The thirty-seventh Article, which was framed under Elizabeth, expressly denies to the civil magistrate the right to administer the Word or the sacraments. But her visitatorial power had no defined limits. She did not hesitate to prescribe what should be preached and what should not be, and what rites should be practiced and what omitted, in a style which reminds one of the Byzantine emperors in the age of Justinian. She was not satisfied with disposing of ecclesiastical possessions at her will. Sir Christopher Hatton, one of the Queen's favorites, built his house in the garden of Cox, the Bishop of Ely; and when he attempted to prevent the spoliation, she wrote him a laconic note, in which she threatened with an oath to "unfrock" him if he did not instantly comply with her behest. She forbade, in the most peremptory manner, the meetings of clergymen for discussion and mutual improvement, called "prophesyings." When Archbishop Grindal objected to her order and reminded her that the regulation of such matters belongs to the Church itself and to its bishops, she kept him suspended from his office for a number of years. The doctrine of Cartwright annihilated such pretensions. But the controversy which it opened upon the proper constitution of the Church, especially upon the questions relating to episcopacy, was destined to shake the English Church to its foundations. He found a vigorous opponent in Whitgift; and there were not wanting many other learned and eager disputants on each side. Before the end of Elizabeth's reign a division appeared among the Puritans, through the rise of the Independents.[1] They

[1] Hanbury, *Hist. Memorials relative to the Independents* (3 vols. London, 1839). Waddington, *Congregational Church History from the Reformation to* 1662 (London, 1862).

took the ground that national churches have no rightful existence. They differed from the other Puritans in being Separatists. According to their system, as it is explained later by John Robinson, their principal leader, the local Church is independent; autonomic in its polity; its members being bound together by a covenant; its teachers being elected and its discipline managed by popular vote. The Independents did not recognize the Church of England, in its national form, as a true Church; but the separate parish churches organized under it might be true churches of Christ. Their prime fault was the neglect of discipline, in consequence of which some other proof of Christian character must be required, besides membership in them. During the reign of Elizabeth, the Independents had acquired no considerable power, although they were the victims of cruel persecution.

About the end of the sixteenth century, a new turn was given to the Puritan controversy by the great work of Hooker, the treatise on Ecclesiastical Polity. The elevated tone of this work, combined with its vigorous reasoning and its eloquence, seemed to take up the controversy into a higher atmosphere.[1] Hooker endeavors to go to the bottom of the subject by investigating the nature of laws and the origin of authority. One of his fundamental propositions is that the Church is endued with a legislative authority by its Founder, within the limits set by Him. It may vary its organization and methods of worship, and it is shut down to no prescribed system. He holds that Episcopacy is an apostolical institution, and is the best form of government; but he appears to think that the general Church, "as the highest subject of power," is not absolutely bound to adhere to this system. Since the Church is thus an authorized lawgiver, it is factious to disobey the regulations which the Church establishes, where they do not contravene the laws of its Founder. Hooker identifies Church and State, considering the two as different aspects of functions of one and the same society. The supremacy of the king over the Church is the logical corollary. It is remarkable that he answers the complaint that Christian people are deprived of a voice

[1] The temper of Hooker may be judged from the following noble sentence: "There will come a time when three words, uttered with charity and meekness, shall receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit." *Ecclesiast. Polity: Preface.*

in the choice of their officers, by bringing forward the theory of the social compact, the same theory as that which Locke afterwards presented. In truth, this theory is one of the cardinal principles of Hooker. It is a government of laws, and not a despotism, which he advocates both for the State and for the Church. His conception of a limited monarchy was one not agreeable to the theory or practice of the Tudors. But he curiously applies this theory to justify such customs as the control exercised by patrons in the appointment of the clergy.

As we look back to the beginnings of the Puritan controversy in the reign of Edward and at the accession of Elizabeth, it seems plain that the questions were those on which good and wise men among the Protestants might differ. Half of the nation was Catholic. The clergy were of such a character that out of ten thousand not more than a few hundred chose to leave their places rather than conform to the Protestant system of Edward. A great part of them were extremely ignorant, and an equal number preferred the Roman Catholic system to any other. How can the people ever be won from popery, the Puritans demanded, if no very perceptible change is made in the modes of worship and in the apparel of the ministry? If the distinctive emblems and badges of popery are left, how shall the people be brought out of that system, and be led to give up the whole theory of priestly mediation? But the state of things that moved one party to adopt this conclusion had an opposite effect upon the judgment of their opponents. Protestantism may fail altogether, they argued, if it breaks too abruptly with the traditional customs to which a great part of the nation are attached. Better to retain whatever is anywise compatible with the essentials of Protestantism, and wean the people from their old superstitions by a gentler process. Hold on to the apparel and the ceremonies, but carefully instruct the people as to their real significance. Thus the true doctrine will be saved; and, moreover, the religious life of the nation will preserve, in a degree, its continuity and connection with the past. The tract of Lord Bacon on the "Pacification of the Church," which was written in the reign of the successor of Elizabeth, is a calm and moderate review of the Puritan controversy, in which both parties come in for about an equal share of censure.[1] He com-

[1] Bacon's *Works* (Montagu's ed.), vii. 61 seq.

plains of the Puritans, among other things, for insisting that there is one prescribed form of discipline for all churches and for all time. He asserts that there are "the general rules of government: but for rites and ceremonies, and for the particular hierarchies, policies, and disciplines of churches, they be left at large." He complains of "the partial affectation and imitation," [1] by the Puritans, "of the foreign churches." But in respect to many of the evils against which the Puritans protested, such as non-residence, pluralities, and the ignorance of the clergy, he is in sympathy with them. He thinks that liberty should have been granted in various things which were allowed by the ruling party to be indifferent. He would give up the required use of the ring in marriage; would give liberty in respect to the surplice; and he would not exact subscriptions for rites and ceremonies, as for articles of doctrine. At the time when Bacon wrote, the opponents of the Puritans were beginning to look with favor on a theory which had not been held by them before that the episcopal polity is necessary to the existence of a church. Thus the Episcopalians, as well as the Presbyterians, contended alike for the exclusive lawfulness of their respective systems.

The controversy of Churchman and Puritan is not extinct; but however opinions may differ in regard to the English Reformation and the merits of the principal actors in it, every one at the present day must rejoice that no tempest of iconoclasm ever swept over England. Whoever looks on those

> —"Swelling hills and spacious plains,
> Besprent from shore to shore with steeple-towers,"

can partake of a brilliant French writer's admiration for "that practical good sense which has effected revolutions without committing ravages; which, while reforming in all directions, has destroyed nothing; which has preserved both its trees and its constitution, which has lopped off the dead branches without leveling the trunk; which alone, in our days, among all nations, is in the enjoyment not only of the present but the past." [2]

[1] "I, for my part, do confess, that, in revolving the Scriptures, I could never find any such thing; but that God had left the like liberty to the Church government as he had done to the civil government," etc. — Bacon's *Works*, vii. 68.

[2] Taine, *History of English Literature*, ii. 517.

The history of the Scottish Reformation is closely interwoven with that of Elizabeth's reign. Her security depended on the divisions of her enemies, on the mutual jealousies of the Catholic powers. To prevent them from making common cause against her was one of the principal elements of her policy. It was, also, essential that neither of them should acquire such strength and liberty of action as would endanger her safety. Scotland, the old enemy of England, and the old ally of France, was the point from which, as she feared and her enemies hoped, the most dangerous assault might be made upon her and upon English Protestantism. The peril was much augmented by the position of Mary, Queen of Scots, in relation to the Catholic governments, and by the schemes and aspirations that grew out of her claims to the English throne.

In Scotland the spirit of feudalism was not reduced, as it was in England: the feeling of clanship was strong, and the nobles felt none of that deference to the sovereign which was manifested in the neighbor country and in France. The Scottish King was without a standing army or even a bodyguard, and must depend for his personal protection, as well as for his support in war, on the feudal militia of the country, who took the field under their own lords. The natural roughness of the aristocracy of Scotland was little softened, except in a few instances, by their intercourse with the polite nobility of France. On the contrary, "their dress was that of the camp or stable; they were dirty in person and abrupt and disrespectful in manner, carrying on their disputes, and even fighting out their fierce quarrels, in the presence of royalty, which had by no means accomplished the serene, imperial isolation which the sovereigns of France had achieved since the days of Francis I. With the exception of one or two castles, which had been built in the French style, the best families were crowded into narrow square towers, in which all available means had been exhausted in strength, leaving nothing for comfort or beauty."[1] The royal residences, with the exception of the new palace, Holyrood, were little better. The common people, poor but proud, self-willed and boisterous in their manners, could not, as in France, be kept at a distance from royalty. In the reign of James V., and generally during the regency of his Queen, the

[1] Burton, *History of Scotland*, iv. 173.

clergy and the sovereign were allied by a common desire to curb the power of the nobility. The clergy profited by the forfeitures and penalties inflicted on the aristocracy. This was one reason why the nobles were inclined to favor Protestantism. The lay gentry had their eyes fixed on the vast estates of their clerical rivals.[1] The Protestant tendency, however, was opposed by the fixed, hereditary feeling of hostility to England and to the predominance of English influence.

Perhaps there was no country where the Church stood in greater need of reformation than Scotland. The clergy were generally illiterate. In the fifteenth century, three universities had been founded in Scotland, — St. Andrews, Glasgow, and Aberdeen; but they appear to have accomplished little in elevating the character of the clergy, although they arose in time to serve effectually the cause of the Reformation. In Scotland the Reformation was not preceded, but followed, by the revival of letters. Not only was the law of celibacy practically abolished, but the priestly order was extremely dissolute. Half of the property of the kingdom was in their hands. The covetousness of the lay lords and a prevalent just indignation at the profligacy of the clerical body were the moving forces of the Reformation. It should be mentioned that praiseworthy, but ineffectual, attempts were made by the old Church to abolish the most crying abuses.[2] After the Protestant spirit began to manifest itself, when the clergy met the rebukes that were addressed to them with cruel persecution, the popular indignation acquired a double intensity. We find, throughout the Scottish Reformation, a tone of unrelenting hostility to the papal system of religion; a temper identical with that of the prophets of the Old Testament in reference to formalism and idolatry in the Jewish Church.

There were martyrs to the Reformation in the reign of James V., the most noted of whom was Patrick Hamilton, who had been a student at Marburg, and whose death made a profound impression. Under the regency of the widow of James, after the assassination of Cardinal Beaton, the principal instigator of persecution, there was, for a long time, a mild policy in the treatment of heresy. The Earl of Arran, the Lord Pro-

[1] Burton, iv. 25.
[2] *Ibid.*, iv. 40. Lee, *Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland*, i. 72 seq.

tector, at first favored the Protestant side. During the reign of Mary of England, the hostility of France to Philip of Spain and to his English Queen, operated to secure a lenient treatment in Scotland for Protestant refugees from across the border. The Conspiracy of Amboise had not then taken place, and the Guises, the brothers of the Regent, had not fairly entered on their grand crusade against the Huguenots and the House of Bourbon. But Mary of England died in November, 1558, and was succeeded by Elizabeth. Events were hastening toward a religious war in France; the Conspiracy of Amboise was formed in 1560. At the instigation of her brothers, as it is supposed, the Regent changed her course, and undertook to carry out repressive measures. It was in 1559 that John Knox returned to Scotland from the Continent, and the crisis of the Scottish Reformation soon ensued.

Little is known of the parentage of Knox. At the University of Glasgow, he was a contemporary of the celebrated scholar and historian, George Buchanan; and he had among his teachers John Mair, or Major, who had been in the University of Paris, and had brought home with him the Gallican theory of church government, together with radical opinions upon the right of revolution, and the derivation of kingly authority from popular consent. Major had also imbibed the opinion of the ancients that tyrannicide is a virtue. He was not an able man; yet he may have contributed somewhat to the development of kindred opinions in the mind of Knox.[1] Knox read diligently Augustine and Jerome, and heartily embraced the Reformed faith. Beaton was assassinated in 1546 by conspirators, some of whom were moved by resentment for private injuries, and some by a desire to deliver the country from his cruelties. Knox himself professes to acquiesce in this event, so far as it was providential, or the act of God; though it is evident, likewise, that he has little, if any, repugnance towards it, considered as the act of man. The enemies of Beaton took refuge in the Castle of St. Andrews. Knox joined them, with private pupils, whom he was then instructing. There he was called to preach, and reluctantly complied with the imperative summons of his brethren. But the castle was taken by the French; he was carried as a captive to

[1] McCrie, *Life of Knox* (6th ed., 1839), p. 30. Mair is ridiculed by Buchanan. Lee, i. 33, 34.

France, and experienced hard usage there. After his release, he was actively employed in preaching, principally in the north of England, and produced a great effect by his honesty, earnestness, and blunt eloquence. Not fully satisfied with the ecclesiastical system established by Cranmer, he declined a bishopric in the English Church. During the reign of Mary, he was for a while at Frankfort, and there led the party in the Church of the exiles, who were opposed to the use of the English Prayer-book, without certain alterations which they demanded. The most of this period he spent at Geneva, in the society of Calvin and the other Genevan preachers, and in active labor as pastor of a church composed of English and Scotch residents. It was at Geneva that he put forth his unlucky publication, entitled the "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regimen of Women"; a work which was specially aimed, as he afterwards explained to Mary of Scotland and to Elizabeth, at "the bloody Jezebel" who was then reigning in England, but which denied the right of women to rule nations, as a general proposition in ethics. Notwithstanding the inconvenience which this doctrine occasioned him afterwards, he had the manliness to refuse to retract it. His clumsy attempts at apology, for he was even more awkward in framing apologies than Luther, did not conciliate the good will of Elizabeth.

During the reign of Mary of England, while there was war between France and Spain, the Scottish exiles were able to come back to their country. Knox returned in 1555, and in the following year the Scottish Protestant lords united in a solemn Covenant to defend their religion against persecution. The government once more renewed its repressive measures, and Knox, who had held his meetings in various places with much effect, was again forced to leave. The Scottish "Lords of the Congregation" now resolved at every hazard to put an end to the persecution. The jealous feeling which was awakened respecting the designs of France upon Scotland, and which was augmented by the marriage of Mary to the Dauphin, combined a powerful party against the Regent. The lords and the Protestant preachers stood in opposition to the Queen and the Catholic clergy. Knox returned and thundered in the pulpit against the idolatry of the Romish worship. In Perth a sermon in denunciation of the worship of images was followed by a rising

of what Knox calls "the rascal multitude," which demolished them, and pulled down the monasteries. The same thing was done elsewhere; and this iconoclasm is one of the characteristic features of the Scottish Reform. In the armed contest that ensued, the Regent gained such advantages that Elizabeth was reluctantly obliged to furnish open assistance to the Protestant party, to save Scotland from falling into the hands of the French. Her position was an embarrassing one to herself. She detested Knox and his principles. She abhorred, especially, the political theory which the Scottish Protestants avowed and put in practice, that subjects may take up arms against their sovereign. Yet the political situation was such that she was obliged, as a choice of evils, to render them aid. This she had done before clandestinely. But now the peril was so imminent that she was forced to come out in the face of day and send her troops to the assistance of the lords. Even the King of Spain, the champion of Catholicism, was so unwilling to see the French masters of Scotland that he rejoiced in the success of Elizabeth's interference. The Treaty of Edinburgh, by which the French were to evacuate Leith and leave the country limited essentially the prerogatives of the Scottish sovereign: war and peace could not be made without the consent of the Estates. The Queen-regent died on the 10th of June, 1560. The Estates convened in August. The Calvinistic Confession of Faith was approved, the Roman Catholic religion was abolished, and the administering of the mass, or attendance upon it, was forbidden — the penalty for the third offense being death. "On the morning of the 25th of August, 1560, the Romish hierarchy was supreme; in the evening of the same day, Calvinistic Protestantism was established in its stead." [1] But whether the Acts of Parliament would abide and be effectual or not "depended on events yet to come."

Knox and his fellow-ministers found themselves at variance with their lay supporters on the question of the adoption of the "First Book of Discipline," the restraints of which were not at all acceptable to the lords and lairds who had received the Calvinistic doctrines with alacrity. There was involved in this dispute another question which came up separately — that of the disposition to be made of ecclesiastical property. Knox and the preachers were bent upon devoting it to the new Church,

[1] Burton, iv. 89.

for the sustenance of ministers, schools, and universities. To this measure the lords of the congregation, among whom the desire for the lands and possessions which they were able to appropriate at the overthrow of the old religion was quite as potent as religious zeal, would not consent. The new Church was obliged to content itself with a portion of the property that had belonged to the old. Knox, who was skillful in penetrating the political schemes of his adversaries, gave his lay friends credit for more sincerity and disinterestedness than they really had. It was a weakness that sprang out of his own simple-hearted honesty and zeal. But in this matter of the "Book of Discipline" and the Church property, he saw their motives, and gave free utterance to his wrath.

Francis II., the young husband of Queen Mary, died on the 5th of December, 1560. By this event, Catharine de Medici, who hated Mary, acquired power, and set about the work of mediating between the two contending parties that divided France that she might control them both. Scotland was relieved from danger arising out of the ambitious plans of the Guises. Mary returned to her native kingdom to assume her crown. We need not give credence to the extravagant praises of such admirers as Brantome, who accompanied her on her voyage to Scotland; but that she was beautiful in person, of graceful and winning manners, quick-witted, accomplished, with a boundless fund of energy, there is no doubt. She had grown up in the atmosphere of deceit and corruption which surrounded the French court, in the society, if not under the influence, of Catharine de Medici. Brantome himself, the licentious chronicler, and Châtelar, the ill-starred poet, another of her French attendants, who was afterwards beheaded for hiding himself under her bed, suggest in part the character of the associations in which she had been placed. She came to reign over a kingdom where the strictest form of Calvinism had been made the law of the land. No contrast can be more striking than that presented by this youthful Queen, fresh from the gayeties of her "dear France" and from the homage of the courtiers that thronged her steps, and the homely and austere surroundings of her new abode. Brantome records that she wept for hours together on the voyage; and when she saw the horses that had been sent to convey her from Leith to Holyrood, she again burst

into tears. The situation was such that any active opposition to the newly established religion would have been futile and disastrous to herself. The Guises were absorbed in the civil contest in France, and could not undo the work which the Protestants in Scotland had effected. Whatever hopes Mary had of either succeeding or supplanting Elizabeth would have been destroyed by a premature exhibition of an anti-Protestant policy. Mary contented herself with celebrating mass in her own chapel and in other places where she sojourned. The principal direction of affairs was left in the hands of her half-brother, the Earl of Murray, the leader of the Protestant nobles. She even united with Murray in crushing the Earl of Huntley, the richest and most powerful of the Catholic lords, who, however, had not shown himself a steady or disinterested friend of the old religion. The enthusiastic admirers and apologists of Mary maintain that she was sincerely in favor of toleration. They would make her a kind of apostle of religious liberty. It is an unreasonable stretch of charity, however, to suppose that she would not from the beginning have rejoiced in the restoration, and, had it been feasible, the forcible restoration of the old religion. It is one of her good points that she never forsook her own faith from motives of self-interest, and never swerved from her fidelity to it, save in one instance and for a brief interval, when she was carried away by her passion for Bothwell. That she should "serve the time and still commode herself discreetly and gently with her own subjects," and "in effect to repose most on them of the reformed religion," was the policy which had been sketched for her in France, as we learn from her faithful friend, Sir James Melville.[1] Her letters to Pope Pius IV., and to her uncle, the Cardinal of Lorraine, in 1563, plainly declare her inclination to bring back the old religious system to its former supremacy. She steadfastly withheld her assent from the acts of Parliament which changed the religion of the country; and it was an unsettled constitutional question whether acts of this nature were valid without the sovereign's approval. It was natural, as it was evident, that Mary "had no idea of risking her position in Scotland by any premature display of zeal" in behalf of her religion and in hostility to that legally sanctioned. "It seems to have been her hope that she would gather round

[1] *Memoirs*, p. 88.

her in time a party strong enough to effect a change of religion by constitutional means." A different policy was not commended to her by her counselors abroad or by the Pope himself.[1] She was careful to prevent any overt movement against the old religion, while guarding the means, should an opportunity occur, to secure the restoration of it. Murray conducted the government with a view to keep in check both of the religious parties, to maintain the Protestant establishment, but at the same time to protect Mary in the personal enjoyment of her own worship.

The resolution of the Queen to have mass in her chapel, and the secret design, which Knox more and more believed her to cherish, to reëstablish popery, found in that reformer an immovable antagonist. His "History of the Reformation of Religion in Scotland," that quaint and original work, in which he describes his own career, narrates the rise and progress of the great conflict, in which the Queen, with her rare powers of fascination and influence, stood on one side, and he on the other. When the preparations for the first mass were perceived (on the 24th of August, 1561), "the hearts of all the godly," he says, "began to be bolden; and men began openly to speak, 'shall that idol be suffered again to take place within this realm? It shall not.'"[2] It was proposed that the "idolater priest should die the death according to God's law." But Murray guarded the chapel door "that none should have entrance to trouble the priest." Murray's excuse was, however, "that he would stop all Scotsmen to enter the mass." After a little while, the Protestant lords, out of respect to the Queen's declaration that her conscience bound her to adhere to the obnoxious rite, were disposed to permit her to do so. They were bewitched, as Knox thought, by the enchantress; and he inveighed in his pulpit against idolatry, declaring that one mass was "more fearful unto him than if ten thousand armed enemies were landed in any part of the realm, of purpose to suppress the holy religion." The Queen resolved to try the effect of a personal interview, and of her skill in reasoning, upon this most intractable and powerful of all the professors of the new faith. None were present, within hearing, but Murray. It was the first of the memorable con-

[1] *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. III., p. 267.
[2] Knox, *History*, etc. (Glasgow, 1832), p. 247.

ferences or debates which Knox had with the Queen. We follow his own narrative. "The Queen," he says, "accused him, that he had raised a part of her subjects against her mother and against herself; that he had written a book against her just authority — she meant the Treatise against the Regimen of Women — which she had and should cause the most learned in Europe to write against; that he was the cause of great sedition and great slaughter in England; and that it was said to her that all that he did was by necromancy. To which the said John answered, 'Madam, it may please your Majesty patiently to hear my simple answers. And first,' said he, 'if to teach the truth of God in sincerity, if to rebuke idolatry, and to will a people to worship God according to His Word, be to raise subjects against their princes, then cannot I be excused; for it has pleased God of His mercy to make me one, among many, to disclose unto this realm the vanity of the papistical religion, and the deceit, pride, and tyranny of that Roman Antichrist.'" He began with this perspicuous statement of his position. He went on to say that the true knowledge of God promotes obedience to rulers, and that Mary had received as unfeigned obedience from "such as profess Christ Jesus," as ever her ancestors had received from their bishops. As to his book, he was ready to retract if he could be confuted, but he felt able to sustain its doctrines against any ten who might attempt to impugn them. Knox had an unbounded confidence in his cause, and no distrust of his own prowess in the defense of it. "You think," said Mary, "that I have no just authority?" To this direct inquiry, he replied by referring to Plato's "Republic," in which the philosopher "damned many things that then were maintained in the world"; yet this did not prevent him from living quietly under the systems of government which he found existing. "I have communicated," he added, "my judgment to the world; if the realm finds no inconveniency in the regimen of a woman, that which they approve I shall not further disallow, than within my own heart, but shall be as well content to live under your grace, as Paul was to live under Nero. And my hope is that as long as that ye defile not your hands with the blood of the saints of God, that neither I nor that book shall either hurt you or your authority; for, in very deed, Madam, that book was written most especially against that wicked Jezebel of England."

"But," said the Queen, "ye speak of women in general." To this Knox responded that he could be charged with making no disturbance, but that his preaching in England and elsewhere had promoted quietness. As to the charge of necromancy, he could endure that, seeing that his Master was accused of being "possessed with Beelzebub." Leaving Knox's offensive book, Mary reminded him that God commands subjects to obey their princes, and asked him how he reconciled his conduct, in persuading the people "to receive another religion than their princes can allow," with that precept. Knox replied that subjects are not "bound to frame their religion according to the appetite of their princes," and appealed to the example of the Israelites in Egypt, and to the example of Daniel, on which he dilated at some length. "Yet," said she; "none of them raised the sword against their princes." Knox answered that still they denied obedience to their mandates. Mary was not to be driven from her point, and replied: "But yet they resisted not by the sword." "God," said he, "Madam, had not given them the power and the means." "Think ye," said she, "that subjects having power may resist their princes?" "If their princes exceed their bounds," said he, "Madam, and do against that wherefore they should be obeyed, it is no doubt but they may be resisted, even by power;" and he compared this resistance to the restraint imposed by children upon a frenzied father. "At these words, the Queen stood, as it were, amazed, more than a quarter of an hour; her countenance altered, so that Lord James began to entreat her and to demand, 'What has offended you, Madam?' At length she said, 'Well, then, I perceive that my subjects shall obey you, and not me; and shall do what they list, and not what I command: and so must I be subject to them, and not they to me.'" Knox demurred to this conclusion. "My travail is that both princes and subjects obey God." Kings and queens were to be foster-fathers and nurses to the Kirk. Excited by the debate, Mary went, perhaps, further than she had designed. "But ye are not the Kirk that I will nurse. I will defend the Kirk of Rome, for it is, I think, the true Kirk of God." "Your will," said he, "Madam, is no reason, neither doth your thought make that Roman harlot to be the true and immaculate spouse of Jesus Christ. And wonder not, Madam, that I call Rome a harlot; for that Kirk is altogether polluted with all

kind of spiritual fornication, as well in doctrine as in manners." He offered to prove that the "Kirk of the Jews," when it crucified Jesus, was not so far removed from true religion "as that Kirk of Rome is declined." "My conscience," said Mary, "is not so." Conscience, he answered, requires knowledge; and he proceeded to say that she had enjoyed no true teaching. Descending to particulars, he pronounced the mass "the invention of man," and therefore "an abomination before God." To his harangue, Mary said, "If they were here whom I have heard, they would answer you." Knox expressed the wish that the "most learned Papist in Europe" were present, that she might learn "the vanity of the papistical religion," and how little ground it had in the Word of God. Knox departed, wishing that she might be as great a blessing to Scotland "as ever Deborah was in the commonwealth of Israel." He remarks that she "continued in her massing; and despised and quietly mocked all exhortation." Being asked by his friends at the time what he thought of her, he said, "If there be not in her a proud mind, a crafty wit, and an indurate heart against God and his truth, my judgment faileth me." In Knox, as he appears in these interviews, one may behold the incarnation of the democratic spirit of Calvinism. Close attention to the verbal combat of the Queen and Knox does not warrant either the inference that he was of a mind to drive her, for being a Catholic, from the throne, or that she cherished an intent to exterminate the Church protected by the law of the Land.

On another occasion he was summoned to the presence of the Queen, in consequence of his preaching about the dancing at Holyrood. Knox said that in the presence of her Council she was grave, but "how soon soever the French fillocks, fiddlers, and others of that band gat into the house alone, then might be seen skipping not very comely for honest women." It must be remarked that the dances in vogue then would not now be deemed very comely, even by liberal critics.[1] "He was called and accused, as one that had irreverently spoken of the Queen, and that travailed to bring her into hatred and contempt of the people." "The Queen," he says, "made a long harangue," to which he replied by repeating exactly what he had said in the pulpit. In the course of the conversation he freely expressed

[1] Burton, iv. 209.

his opinion of her uncles, whom he styled "enemies to God and unto his son Jesus Christ," and declined her request that he would come and make what criticisms he had to make upon her conduct to her personally. He could not wait upon individuals, but it was his function "to rebuke the sins and vices of all" in his sermons, which he invited her to come and hear. He was too shrewd to consent to be silent in public for the sake of the privilege of conversing with her in private. She showed her displeasure. But "the said John departed with a reasonable merry countenance; whereat some Papists, offended, said, 'He is not afraid;' which heard of him, he answered, 'Why should the pleasing face of a gentlewoman fear me? I have looked in the faces of many angry men, and yet have not been afraid above measure.'"

The mass and auricular confession were not wholly given up, especially in the western districts south of the Clyde. "The brethren," says Knox, "determined to put to their own hands," and no longer wait for King or Council, but "execute the punishment that God had appointed to idolaters in his law, by such means as they might, wherever they should be apprehended." The brethren had begun this work of executing the law for themselves, when the Queen, who was at Lochleven, sent for Knox. He defended the proceeding. Where kings neglect their duty of executing the laws, the people may do it for them, and even restrain kings, he added, in case they spare the wicked and oppress the innocent. "The examples," he said, "are evident. for Samuel feared not to slay Agag, the fat and delicate King of Amalek, whom King Saul had saved: neither spared Elias Jezebel's false prophets and Baal's priests, albeit that King Ahab was present. Phineas was no magistrate, and yet feared he not to strike Cozbi and Zimri" — and he specified in the plainest words the sin of which they were guilty. He informed Mary that she must fulfill her part of "the mutual contract," if she expected to get obedience from her subjects.[1] "The said John left her," but, much to his surprise, early the next morning, she sent for him again. He met her "at the hawking, by West Kincross. Whether it was the night's sleep, or deep dissimulation, that made her to forget her former anger, wise men may doubt." She conversed with him in a familiar and confidential

[1] *History*, p. 285.

style, asking his good offices to restore peace between the Earl of Argyle and his wife; and wound up the conference by alluding to the interview of the previous night, and by promising "to minister justice" as he had required. Many arrests were actually made, apparently in pursuance of her promise. But from about this time (1563), symptoms of a Romish reaction were manifest. The Queen's influence began to have its effect. Knox was not ignorant of her communications with France, Spain, and the Papal Court; for he had his own correspondents on the Continent.[1] From this time Knox and the Queen were really engaged in a contest, each for the extermination of the other.[2] When it was known that she was considering the question of a marriage with the Archduke of Austria, or with Don Carlos, the son of Philip II., and when Knox found the Protestant nobles lukewarm or indifferent on the subject, he did not hesitate to thunder in the pulpit against the scheme, and to predict direful consequences, should the nobles allow it to be carried out. Exasperated at this new interference, the Queen summoned him to her presence, and with passionate outbursts of weeping denounced his impertinent meddling with affairs that did not belong to him. Knox maintained his imperturbable coolness, although he declared that he had no pleasure in seeing her weep, since that he could not, without pain, see the tears of his own boys when he chastised them. Dismissed from the Queen's presence, he was detained for a while in the adjacent room, where he "merrily" uttered a quaint homily to the ladies of the court on their "gay gear" and on the havoc that death would make with their flesh and all their finery; a speech in a tone that has been aptly likened to that of the soliloquy of the grave-digger in Hamlet.

In the summer of 1563, during the absence of the Queen from Edinburgh, her followers who were left behind attempted to hold mass in the chapel at Holyrood. An unusual number from the town joined them. "Divers of the brethren, being sore offended, consulted how to redress that enormity." They resorted to the spot in order to note down the names of such as might come to participate in the unlawful rite. It appears that the chapel door was burst open, "whereat, the priest and the French dames, being affrayed, made the shout to be sent to the

[1] Burton, iv. 219. [2] *Ibid.*

town." Two of the party were indicted "for carrying pistols within the burgh, convention of lieges at the palace, and invasion of the Queen's servants." Knox, who had been clothed with authority to summon the faithful together in any grave emergency, issued a circular calling upon them to be in Edinburgh on the day which had been designated for the trial. The Queen imagined that she had now caught him in a plain violation of the law. He was required to appear before her and the Privy Council, to which were joined a considerable number of government officers and nobles. He gives a graphic description of the scene and of the colloquies that took place. He states also that "the bruit rising in the town that John Knox was sent for by the Queen, the brethren of the Kirk followed in such number that the inner close was full, and all the stairs, even to the chamber door where the Queen and Council sat." This gathering of his supporters would, of itself, disincline the Council to molest him; but, independently of the immediate danger attending such a step, the Protestant lords, the subtle and unprincipled Lethington, for example, however they might charge him with fanaticism, were not at all disposed to assume a position of hostility towards him. He had leave to depart, but did not go until he had turned to the Queen and prayed that "God would purge her heart from Popery and preserve her from the counsel of flatterers." It is a mark of the steadfast honesty of Knox that he broke off intercourse, for a long time, with Murray, whom he honored and loved, but whom, in conjunction with the other lords, he blamed for neglecting, in the Parliament of 1563, the first Parliament after the Queen's arrival, to ratify the treaty of peace made in 1560, and the establishment of the Protestant religion.[1] The principal business done at that session was to give a legal security to the appropriations that had been made of the church lands, by which the nobles had so much profited. It was a short time after this meeting of Parliament that Knox preached the famous sermon to which we have referred on the Queen's marriage.

The gloomy prospects of the cause of reform led Knox to adopt a form of public prayer for the Queen, in which the Almighty was besought to "deliver her from the bondage and thraldom of Satan," and thus save the realm "from that plague

[1] McCrie, p. 255.

and vengeance that inevitably follows idolatry," as well as her own soul from "that eternal damnation which abides all obstinate and impenitent unto the end." At an assembly of the Kirk in the summer of 1564, the propriety of this prayer came up for discussion. At this meeting the lay lords, Murray, Hamilton, Argyle, Morton, Lethington, and others, entered into debate with the clerical leaders on this question and on the proper treatment of the Queen. But Knox and his associates asserted that the mass is idolatry, and, by Old Testament law and precedents, must be punished with death. No vote was taken; but it was soon evident to the lay leaders that there was no room for a middle party, and no hope that the Queen would abandon her "idolatry."

It is obvious that Knox and his followers were no disciples of the doctrine of toleration. Two things, however, deserve to be noticed. First, there was no kingdom where Roman Catholics having the relative strength of the Calvinists of Scotland would have endured for a moment a Protestant sovereign. The story of Henry IV. of France shows what the Catholic party demanded, even when there was a powerful minority opposed to them. Secondly, Knox and his associates were well convinced that the Queen, notwithstanding her fair professions, only waited for a favorable opportunity to extirpate them and to bring back the papal system, the abolition of which she did not concede to be legal. But, apart from these considerations, the Roman Catholic rites, in the eyes of Knox, were idolatry which must be capitally punished and utterly suppressed; otherwise the judgments of heaven would fall on the land. He attributed the partial failure of the crops to the wrath of God at the Queen's mass.

The Protestants had a feeling of insecurity, a feeling that their cause was being cautiously undermined. They watched with eager attention the various negotiations having respect to the Queen's marriage. Had they been fully aware of the efforts that were made to effect a marriage between Mary and Don Carlos of Spain, which were defeated by the machinations of Catharine de Medici, through her jealousy of the house of Guise, they would have been filled with alarm and indignation. The propositions of Elizabeth, including that of a marriage of Mary to Leicester, fell to the ground. How far the English Queen

was sincere in them it is impossible to say, since even her most sagacious advisers could not fathom her duplicity. One obstacle in the way of Elizabeth's matrimonial schemes for Mary was the steady refusal of the former definitely to guarantee the succession to her sister of Scotland. She meant to retain this safeguard for her life in her own hands. All plans of this sort were cut off by Mary's marriage with Darnley. It was a case of mutual love at first sight. Darnley was Mary's cousin, and the grandson of Margaret, the sister of Henry VIII., and of the Earl of Angus, whom she married after the death of her first husband, James IV. Mary was charmed with his personal appearance — his tall form, the breadth of his shoulders, and his smooth, handsome face. Darnley was a Catholic. Murray and the Protestants opposed the marriage as a decisive step towards the restoration of the old religion. They complained that the laws against idolatry were not enforced. Mary had taken a husband without consulting her Parliament, which, if not illegal, was indecorous; and she had proclaimed him as King of Scots, which was considered an unconstitutional act.[1] The Queen had married against the remonstrance of Elizabeth and had incurred her displeasure. The hopes of Mary centered in the King of Spain and her other friends on the Continent. The discontented barons, with Murray at their head, took up arms, but not receiving the promised aid from England, their forces were dispersed, and the leaders were compelled to fly across the border. Just at this juncture, it was apprehended that France and Spain would join hands in a common attack upon Protestantism.[1] It was supposed, though erroneously, that Catharine de Medici and her son had signed a league at Bayonne, at the instigation of Alva, for this end. It was believed, also, that Mary had formally attached her signature to the same bond. The political situation was so perilous for England and English Protestantism that Elizabeth was led falsely to disavow all connection with Murray and his enterprise. Had Darnley been an able man, and had his Queen been possessed of a wisdom and self-control equal to her acuteness and vivacity, the subsequent history of Scotland, and of England too, would have been essentially altered. But it

[1] Burton, v. 279.

[2] Mary had applied to the King of Spain for help against her subjects. Hosack, *Mary and her Accusers*, i. 114.

took but a short time for the incompatibility between Mary and Darnley to manifest itself. Elated by his elevation, he offended the nobles by his insolence and airs of superiority. His drunkenness and other low vices soon disgusted, and at length completely alienated, his wife. Mary was imprudent enough to bestow so many marks of favor on Rizzio, an Italian whom she had made her Secretary, that he became an object of bitter hatred to the nobility. They despised him as an upstart and an adventurer who had usurped that place in the counsels and good graces of the Queen which belonged to themselves. Rizzio had promoted the marriage with Darnley. He was considered one of the props of the Roman Catholic faction. Parliament was about to assemble, "the spiritual estate," to quote from a letter of Mary herself, "being placed there in the ancient manner, tending to have done some good anent restoring the auld religion, and to have proceeded against our rebels according to their demerits."[1] The estates of Murray and his confederates were to be forfeited. On the 9th of March, 1566, Rizzio was murdered as the result of a plot of which Darnley on the one part, who was moved by jealousy of Rizzio, and Ruthven and other Protestant lords on the other, who were enraged at the influence acquired by Rizzio, were the authors and executors. Darnley was angry that the crown matrimonial was withheld from him. It was stipulated in a secret agreement of Darnley with the lords that the banished nobles should be restored and the Protestant religion maintained. Rizzio was dragged out of the apartment in which the Queen was supping, and slain in the adjacent room. It was only three months before the birth of the Queen's son, afterwards James VI., whose life, as well as the life of his mother, were exposed to imminent peril by this scene of brutal violence. The Queen's power of dissembling now served her well. She won the feeble Darnley to a coöperation with her scheme, and escaping on Monday, at midnight, from Holyrood — the murder of Rizzio was on Saturday evening — she rode for five hours on horseback, and reached the strong fortress of Dunbar at daylight. The banished lords had appeared in Edinburgh on Sunday, the day after the murder. The new turn that was given to affairs by the Queen's bold and

[1] Letter of Mary to her Councillor, the Bishop of Ross, in Labanoff, i. 342. See Burton, iv. 304.

successful movement obliged Morton, and the other lords who had been directly participant in the destruction of Rizzio, to take refuge for a while in England. The others, including Murray, were received into favor. From this time, as we follow this tragic history, we tread at almost every step upon disputed ground. Around these transactions there have gathered the conflicting sympathies of religious parties, not to speak of the personal feelings which cluster about events of pathetic interest, events which have been selected by great poets as an appropriate theme for the drama. But there are some leading facts that are fully ascertained, and whether they are in every case admitted or not, they cannot plausibly be disputed. One of these facts is the complete estrangement of the Queen from Darnley. He had been mean and treacherous enough to appear before the council and solemnly to affirm, what everybody knew to be false, that he had had no concern in the slaying of Rizzio. He incurred the vindictive hatred of all who had been his confederates in the commission of that act. But Mary took no pains to conceal, she rather took pains to manifest publicly, her thorough dislike and her contempt for him. He was despised and shunned by all. The birth of his son, afterwards James VI. of England and James I. of Scotland, which took place in Edinburgh Castle, on the 19th of June, 1566, did not affect the relations of his parents to one another. The repugnance with which Mary regarded Darnley was known to everybody, and was reported to foreign courts. Another fact is her growing fondness for Bothwell, which was, also, a matter of common observation, and was manifested by unmistakable signs. Bothwell was a brave, adventurous, resolute man, with some exterior polish acquired at the court of France, but unscrupulous and unprincipled. Though connected with the Protestant side, he had stood faithfully by the Queen Regent, Mary's mother, and by Mary herself. He had taken no part in the murder of Rizzio, but on that occasion had himself escaped from Holyrood, and had lent her timely and effective assistance. Although the fact is still questioned by Mary's enthusiastic defenders, it is nevertheless established that her attachment to him grew into an overpowering passion.[1] Bothwell had a wife to whom he had not long been married; Mary had a husband. Such were the

[1] Burton, iv. 324 seq.

hindrances in the way of their union. It was affirmed subsequently by Argyle and Huntley that they, together with Bothwell, Murray, and Lethington, used the disaffection of the Queen towards her husband as a means of obtaining her consent to the pardon and return of Morton and others, who were in banishment on account of their agency in the death of Rizzio. They began by proposing to her a divorce, but "the one thing clear is that a promise was made to rid the Queen of her unendurable husband, and that without a divorce."[1] Morton was allowed to return, but refused to take an active part in the plot, unless he were furnished with a written authorization from Mary, which could not be procured.[2] Murray claimed with truth that he never entered into an engagement for the murder of Darnley; but Lethington, according to the statement of Argyle and Huntley, had said that Murray would "look through his fingers" — that is, stand off and not interfere. Whether Murray was aware of the plot, and was willing to have it succeed by other hands than his own, is a question which cannot be determined. The Queen, just before, gave a striking proof of her affection for Bothwell by paying him a visit when he was ill, at the peril of her own life. Darnley had been taken ill and went to Glasgow, where he was cared for under the direction of his father, the old Earl of Lennox. The Queen announced her purpose to visit him. She made the visit, and after they met, a conversation occurred between Darnley and Crawford, a gentleman in the service of Lennox, whom the latter had instructed to observe and report whatever he saw and heard. The Queen had arranged with Darnley that he should be taken to Craigmillar Castle and there receive medical treatment. Both Crawford and Darnley expressed to one another their dislike of this arrangement, in such terms as imply a suspicion that evil, even murder, might possibly be intended. Darnley expressed to Mary his penitence and his ardent desire for the restoration of the old relations between them. She met his advances apparently in a friendly spirit, and gave him fair promises. A few days later he was removed to Edinburgh, but instead of being taken to Craigmillar, or to Holyrood, he was conveyed to a place close to the

[1] See Burton, iv. 332 seq.

[2] Morton, in the confession that he made before his execution, owned that he was urged by Bothwell to join in the plot, and said, as a reason for not revealing it to the Queen, "She was the doer thereof."

city wall, called the Kirk-of-field, to an uninhabited house that belonged to Robert Balfour, a dependent of Bothwell, several rooms of which had been fitted up for the King's reception. The Queen slept several nights in the room under Darnley's apartment; but on Sunday evening, the 9th of February, 1567, she left his bedside to attend the festivities connected with the wedding of one of her servants at Holyrood. That night the house was blown up with gunpowder, which Bothwell and his followers had placed in the Queen's bedroom, under Darnley. His body was found at some distance from the house. Whether he was strangled, or otherwise killed, before the explosion or not, is still a controverted point. The conspirators had provided themselves with false keys and had deliberately perfected all their arrangements. Whether or not the Queen was privy to the murder, her conduct afterwards was sufficiently imprudent to confirm the worst suspicions. Bothwell, who was known to be the principal criminal, was shielded by a trial so conducted as to be nothing short of a mockery of justice.[1] Instead of experiencing her displeasure, he rose still higher in her favor, and was honored with an accumulation of offices which rendered him the most powerful man in the kingdom. The next great event is the abduction of the Queen by Bothwell, who, at the head of a body of retainers, stopped her on her way, and, without any resistance on her part, conducted her to Stirling Castle. Previously, at a supper which he gave in Edinburgh, possibly through the fear that he inspired, he had prevailed on most of the first men of Scotland to sign a paper recommending the Queen to marry him. In Mary's own account of her capture and of the occurrences at Stirling, she represents that force was used, but merely to such a degree, and accompanied with such protestations of love — which had the more effect from her sense of the great services he had rendered her — that she could only forgive her suitor for this excess and impatience of affection. Sir James Melville, her faithful friend, who had warned her, at the risk of his life, against marrying Bothwell, was with her when she was stopped by him; and he dryly remarks that Captain Blackader, who captured him, told him "that it was with the Queen's own consent."[2] Spottiswoode, who wrote his history at the request

[1] Melville says that everybody suspected Bothwell of the murder. *Memoirs*, p. 78.

[2] *Memoirs*, p. 158.

of James I., her son, says that "No men doubted but this was done by her own liking and consent."[1] Bothwell was divorced from his wife, and the public wedding that united him to the Queen followed. He now governed with a high hand. Mary herself, to her own cost, soon became more fully acquainted with his coarse and despotic nature, and was an unhappy wife. Meantime the principal barons were combining and preparing to crush Bothwell, and they entered into communication with Elizabeth, from whom they sought assistance. At Carberry Hill the forces of Bothwell and the army collected by the lords were arrayed against each other. But a battle was avoided by the surrender of Mary, after a long parley and in pursuance of an arrangement which permitted the escape of Bothwell. She was led to Edinburgh, and treated with great personal indignity, especially by the people, who generally believed in her criminality. From there she was taken as a prisoner to Lochleven. The lords had intercepted a letter, as they asserted, from Mary to Bothwell, which showed that her passion for him had not abated. Sir James Melville, speaking of a letter to the Queen from the Laird of Grange, written at this time, says: "It contained many other loving and humble admonitions, which made her bitterly to weep, *for she could not do that so hastily which process of time might have accomplished*," that is, "*put him* [Bothwell] *clean out of mind.*"[2] This is one among the abundant proofs that whatever constraint had been put upon her movements by Bothwell, the chain that bound her to him was the infatuation of her own heart.

The statements in the foregoing sketch rest upon evidence which is independent of the famous "casket letters" — the letters and love-sonnets addressed by Mary to Bothwell, together with contracts of marriage between them, which, it was alleged, were found in a silver casket, that Bothwell, after his flight, vainly endeavored to procure from the Castle of Edinburgh. But we are assured that "we have only Morton's word for the nature and number of the papers found" in the silver casket. "No inventory of its contents . . . was produced."[3] If the casket letters are genuine, they prove incontestably that in the murder of Darnley, Mary was an accomplice before the act. The genuineness of them has been more or less elaborately discussed, and

[1] *History of the Church of Scotland* (Edinb. ed., 1851), ii. 51.
[2] *Memoirs*, p. 168. [3] A. Lang, *History of Scotland* (1902), p. 563.

has been maintained by the most eminent historians, as Hume, Robertson, Laing, Burton, Mackintosh, Mignet, Ranke. Their genuineness has been defended more lately by Froude, in his "History of England." A very acute writer on the other side is Mr. Hosack, the author of a work upon Mary and her accusers.[1] Not a few dispassionate critics have judged that the letters contain many internal marks of genuineness which it would be quite difficult for a counterfeiter to invent, and that the scrutiny to which they were subjected in the Scottish Privy Council, the Scottish Parliament, and the English Privy Council was such that, if they were forged, it is hard to account for the failure to detect the imposture. Moreover, the character of Murray, although it may be admitted that he was not the immaculate person that he is sometimes considered to have been, must have been black indeed if these documents, which he brought forward to prove the guilt of his sister, were forged. But Murray is praised not only by his personal adherents and by his party, but by men like Spottiswoode and Melville.[2] Ranke, who considers the letters to be genuine, though somewhat altered in passing through the various translations, still hesitates to pronounce a decision in regard to the Queen's foreknowledge of the murder. Another interpretation of the matter was broached — that Mary was actually becoming drawn to her penitent husband, that their reconciliation was sincere; and that Bothwell, seeing the danger that his prize would slip from his grasp, hastened the consummation of his plot. Ranke observes that the solution of the problem belongs to the poet who can open up the depths of the heart, those abysses in which the storms of passion rage, and actions are born which bid defiance to law and to morality, and yet have deep roots in the human soul.[3] It does not appear, however, in what way it is possible to reconcile the genuineness of the casket letters, as Ranke affirms it, with any other supposition than Mary's complicity in the plot in which Bothwell was the chief actor. Evidence is not wanting that they have not been mate-

[1] *Mary Queen of Scots and her Accusers.* By John Hosack, Barrister at Law. 3d edition. 2 vols. London, 1870.

[2] "A man truly good, and worthy to be ranked amongst the best governors that this kingdom hath enjoyed, and, therefore, to this day honored with the title of 'the good Regent.'" — Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland*, ii. 121.

[3] *Englische Gsch.*, i. 267. Of the abduction of Mary, Ranke says: "Halb freiwillig, halb gezwungen, gerieth sie in seine Gewalt, und dadurch in die Nothwendigkeit, ihm ihre Hand zu geben" (p. 269).

rially interpolated.[1] The author of an instructive chapter (VIII.) on "Mary Stewart," in "The Wars of Religion," in Volume III. of "The Cambridge Modern History" (1905), observes respecting the "casket letters": "The tendency of recent discovery and research, rendering at least no longer tenable certain positions maintained by former opponents of their genuineness, is to suggest a large foundation of Mary's actual writing craftily altered or interpolated."[2] Certain facts are referred to as partially explained by this inference.

At Lochleven Mary signed two documents, the one abdicating the throne, the other appointing Murray Regent during the minority of her child. From this date, in public records, the reign of James VI. commences. The infant King was crowned at Stirling, on the 29th of July, 1567.

[1] Burton, v. 181. As to the vexed questions of the guilt or innocence of Mary, and of the genuineness of the casket documents, questions that still interest the minds of men, notwithstanding Mr. Herbert Spencer's judgment upon the frivolity of the whole inquiry, the works of Burton on the one side, and of Hosack on the other, fortunately present the case so adequately that every reader is aided to form a conclusion for himself. Lawson's edition of Bishop Keith's *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland* (printed for the Spottiswoode Soc., 1845), a work favorable to Mary, presents in the Editor's copious notes a large amount of valuable material. Buchanan, in his *History*, but especially in his *Detection of the Actions of Mary Queen of Scots*, which was written under the auspices of Murray, made a rhetorical, yet powerful and effective attack, which reflects the popular feeling, adverse to Mary, that existed at the time in Scotland. Lesly's *Defence of the Honor of Mary*, by one of her zealous adherents, was a plea on the other side. He was followed by other advocates of Mary on the Continent. De Thou, the great French historian, believed with Buchanan, and could not be induced by James I. to retract his verdict against the King's mother. Camden, the English historian of the seventeenth century, maintained her innocence. Anderson and others published the documents. Keith and Goodall wrote in favor of Mary. Tytler, Whitaker, and Chalmers argued on the same side. Robertson appended to the third volume of his *History of Scotland* a carefully studied *Dissertation on King Henry's Murder*, to which he considers that Mary was privy; and Hume maintained the same view in his fourth volume, in the text and in an elaborate note. Both contend for the genuineness of the casket documents. Gilbert Stuart replied to Robertson. An extensive discussion, in agreement with the views of Hume and Robertson, fills two volumes of Malcolm Laing's *History of Scotland*. Prince Alexander Labanoff published, in 1844, a collection in seven volumes, of Queen Mary's Letters. Mr. Froude's condemnation of Mary more lately revived the controversy. *Mary Queen of Scots and her Latest English Historian*, by James F. Meline (New York, 1872), is a polemical work against Froude. The controverted questions concerning Mary are keenly canvassed by Mr. Andrew Lang, *History of Scotland*, 3 vols., 1903. The casket letters are considered in detail, in vol. II, especially in *Appendix A*. One conclusion of Mr. Lang is that "as the evidence stands, the letters could not be founded on by a jury; and the author himself, while unable to reject the testimony of all the circumstances to Mary's guilty foreknowledge of, and acquiescence in, the crime of her husband's murder, cannot entertain any certain opinion as to the entire or partial authenticity of the casket letters."

[2] Thomas Graves Law, p. 279.

In December a Parliament assembled, which confirmed the Acts of 1560 for the establishment of Protestantism. From this time the new Kirk was able to set on foot a more efficient discipline than had been possible before. One sign of the change was the ecclesiastical censure to which all publications were subjected. In the constitution and government of the Scottish Church, the lay eldership has a prominent place. In 1578 the "Second Book of Discipline" embodied the complete Presbyterian hierarchy, ascending from the parish sessions through the presbyteries and provincial synods up to the General Assembly, which was supreme. Superintendents were retained, whose function it was to carry out the measures of the Assembly. At Frankfort, Knox had composed a book of devotion for public worship, which he used in his church at Geneva: "The Forme of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments, &c., used in the English Congregation at Geneva, and approved by the famous and godly learned man, John Calvin." This, with a few changes, became the "Book of Common Order" for the Scottish Church. It contains no form of absolution. It includes a Confession of Faith, which differs from that which Parliament and the General Assembly adopted. This new Confession is derived from Calvin's Catechism, relating to the Apostles' Creed. The doctrine of the Sacrament is identical with that of Calvin, as distinguished from the Lutheran and the earlier Zwinglian theory. There was a general form of expulsion of unworthy persons from the Lord's table, in connection with the ministration of the Sacrament. This was called excommunication or "fencing of the tables." Marriages, as well as baptisms, were celebrated in church and on Sundays. This "Book of Common Order" continued in use for about a hundred years, when it was dropped, in connection with the contest against the English Prayer Book. After the Presbyterian system had been established by the Assembly, the old polity of the Church remained as a matter of law. There were bishops, and also abbots and priors; these places being filled, after 1560, by Protestants, and sometimes by laymen. In 1572 it was agreed between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities that the old names and titles of archbishops and bishops should continue, although the incumbents were to have no power greater than that of superintendents, and were to be subject to the Kirk and General Assembly in spiritual things as they were to the

King in things temporal. The temporalities of the sees had mostly flowed into the hands of laymen. This was what Knox condemned; the revival of episcopacy, in the shadowy form just described, appears to have excited in him little or no opposition.[1] After about twenty years, the Presbyterian system, pure and simple, was established, under the auspices of Andrew Melville. Subsequently, the attempts of James VI. to establish the royal supremacy, and to introduce not only the Anglican polity, but the Anglican ritual, also, began that contest between the Throne and the Kirk, which signalized the next reign, and brought Charles I. to the scaffold.[2]

The Queen of England professed, and probably with sincerity, her high indignation at the treatment of Mary by her subjects. It was a flagrant disregard of Elizabeth's great political maxim "that the head should not be subject to the foot." But in Murray she had a perspicacious and firm man to deal with. It was evident to the counselors of Elizabeth and to Elizabeth herself, that if she interposed to put down the Protestant lords, who had imprisoned Mary and compelled her abdication, they would make common cause with France, and her own throne would be shaken. This conclusion, however, was not reached at once. Mary escaped from Lochleven on the 2d of May, 1568, and an army quickly rallied to her standard. It was then the wish of Elizabeth and her Cabinet to restore her to her throne, without any intervention of the French, and under such circumstances as would effectually secure the safety of England and the ascendency of Elizabeth in her counsels. But Mary's army was defeated at Langside, when she was attempting to march to Dumbarton Castle, and she escaped by a precipitate flight into

[1] Compare McCrie, p. 326 seq., with Burton, v. 318. The documents may be found in Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland* (Wodrow Society), iii. 170 seq. See also Principal Lee, *History of the Church of Scotland*, i. 306, ii. 1 seq.

[2] The last days of Knox were not free from peril and conflict. When the Queen's party obtained the ascendency (in 1571) in Edinburgh, he retired to St. Andrews. James Melville, afterwards a minister, then a student in the college, has left a very interesting description of him, a decrepit old man, with marten fur about his neck, with a staff in hand, and helped along the street by his faithful servant, Richard Bannatyne, "and by the said Richard and another servant lifted up to the pulpit, where he behovit to lean at his first entry, but ere he had done with his sermon, he was so active and vigorous, that he was likely to ding the pulpit in blads and fly out of it." (McCrie, p. 330.) Bannatyne wrote interesting *Memorials* of Knox. Knox died on the 24th of November, 1572. Morton said, over his grave, "that he neither feared nor flattered any flesh." (Burton, v. 327.)

England, where she threw herself on the protection of Elizabeth. The ardent and persevering solicitations of Mary for an interview with the English Queen were put off until she should be cleared of the crime that was imputed to her. Murray and his associates were called upon to justify their proceedings, and brought forward the "casket documents," to substantiate their charges.

Elizabeth might dislike the religious system of the victorious party in Scotland and abhor their political maxims; but they were, in the existing situation of Europe, her allies, and to put Mary back upon her throne would have been an act of suicide. It must be remembered that she never renounced her claim to the crown of England. At this juncture, it was fortunate that the slow and cautious Philip declined the offensive alliance that was offered him by France. In 1569 the victory over the Huguenots in France was followed by a Catholic rebellion in the north of England. The demand was that Mary's title to the succession should be acknowledged. The excommunication of Elizabeth by Pius V. succeeded. Thenceforward, all who sympathized with the spirit of the Catholic reaction in Europe, and acknowledged the Pope's authority, were under the strongest temptation to treat Elizabeth as a usurper who ought to be actually dethroned. The rebellion, under the lead of Norfolk, was undertaken with the express and warm approbation of the Pope, and Philip was only deterred by prudential motives from sending his forces in aid of it; he preferred to wait until the insurgents should have seized on the person of the Queen. The current of events was gradually leading to an open conflict with Spain, which both the Queen and Philip were reluctant to begin. For her own security she secretly provided assistance to the revolted subjects of Philip in the Netherlands, which pleased France, as her aid to the Scottish rebels had gratified Philip. The consequence was that favorable terms were granted to the Netherlands in the Pacification of Ghent, in 1576. It was material to her interests that the Huguenots should not be subdued, and she covertly gave them help while she was in friendly relations with the French government that was seeking to crush them. At length the desperate condition of the Protestants in the Netherlands imposed on her the necessity, in 1585, of openly sending her troops, under the command of Leicester, for their deliverance. Shortly after, Drake appeared before St. Domingo and took possession of that island.

Mary Stuart was the center of the hopes of the enemies of Protestant England and of Elizabeth. Their plots looked to the elevation of Mary to the throne which Elizabeth filled. Political ambition and religious fanaticism were linked together in this great scheme. Mary's life was regarded by the wisest of the English statesmen as a standing menace. When her complicity with the conspiracy of Babington, which involved a Spanish invasion and the dethronement and death of Elizabeth was proved, the execution of Mary followed (1587).

Apart from the interference of Elizabeth in the Netherlands, England and Spain had long been engaged in a desultory warfare on the ocean, where the treasure ships of Philip were captured by Drake and his compeers, and the Spanish colonies harassed by their attacks. The cruelty of the Inquisition to English sailors in Spain quickened the relish of the great English mariners for this kind of retaliation. The sailing of the invincible Armada for the conquest of England was at once the culmination of this prolonged, indefinite conflict, and the supreme effort of the Catholic reaction to annihilate the Protestant strength. The valor of the English seamen, with the winds for their allies, dispersed and destroyed the mighty fleet, and "the northern ocean even to the frozen Thule was scattered with the proud shipwrecks of the Spanish Armada." [1] A deathblow was given to the hopes of the enemies of Protestant England (1588).

A sketch of the Reformation in Great Britain would be incomplete without some notice of the attempts to plant Protestantism in Ireland. Ireland, one of the last of the countries to bow to the supremacy of the Holy See, has been equaled by none in its devotion to the Roman Church, although the independence of the country was wrested from it under the warrant of a bull of Adrian IV., which gave it to Henry II. Protestantism was associated with the hated domination of foreigners, and was propagated according to methods recognized in that age as lawful to the conqueror.[2] Invaders who were engaged in an almost perpetual conflict with a subject race, the course of which was marked by horrible massacres, could hardly hope to convert their enemies to their own religious faith. Henry

[1] Milton, *Of Reformation in England*, b. ii. [2] Hallam, *Const. Hist.*, ch. xviii.

VIII., having made himself the head of the English Church, proceeded to establish his ecclesiastical supremacy in the neighboring island. This was ordained by the Irish Parliament in 1537, but was resisted by a great part of the clergy, with the Archbishop of Armagh at their head. George Browne, a willing agent of the King, who had been Provincial of the Augustine friars in England, was made Archbishop of Dublin. The Protestant hierarchy was constituted, but the people remained Catholic. The mistaken policy of seeking to Anglicize the country was pursued, and the services of religion were conducted in a tongue which they did not understand. The Prayer Book, which was introduced in 1551, was not rendered into Irish, but was to be rendered into Latin, for the sake of ecclesiastics and others who were not acquainted with English! On the accession of Mary, the new fabric which had been raised by Henry VIII. and his son fell to pieces without resistance. As the Catholic Reaction became organized in Europe, and began to wage its contest with Queen Elizabeth, the Irish, who had to some extent attended the English service, generally deserted it. Protestantism had no footing outside of the Pale, or where English soldiers were not present to protect it or force it upon the people. The Episcopal Church in Ireland wore a somewhat Puritanic cast, and in its formularies set forth prominently the Calvinistic theology. The New Testament was not translated into Irish until 1602; and the Prayer Book, though translated earlier, was not sanctioned by public authority, and was little used.[1] Among various wise suggestions in Lord Bacon's tract, written in 1601, entitled "Considerations touching the Queen's service in Ireland," is a recommendation to take care "of the versions of Bibles and catechisms, and other books of instruction, into the Irish language."[2] With equal sagacity and good feeling, he counsels the establishment of colonies or plantations, the sending out of fervent, popular preachers and of pious and learned bishops, and the fostering of education. He recommends mildness and toleration rather than the use of the temporal sword. But the policy which the great philosopher and statesman marked out was very imperfectly followed.

[1] Hardwick, *History of the Reformation*, p. 270.

[2] This tract is in vol. v. of Montagu's edition of Bacon's writings.

CHAPTER XI

THE REFORMATION IN ITALY AND IN SPAIN: THE COUNTER-REFORMATION IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

Protestantism, which in the course of one generation spread over a great part of central and northern Europe, penetrated beyond the Alps and the Pyrenees. But here, in the Italian and Spanish peninsulas, it encountered the first effectual resistance. Here were organized the forces that were to arrest its march, and even to reconquer territory which had been surrendered to the new faith.

After the emancipation of Italy from the control of the German emperors, by the downfall of the Hohenstaufen line, in the middle of the thirteenth century, a period of two centuries and a half elapsed prior to the invasion of Charles VIII. Then Italy became the field and the prize of the conflict between the Spanish-Austrian house and France. The long interval of independence preceding this epoch, notwithstanding the turbulence and confusion that marked the political history of Italy, was the era in which art, letters, trade, and commerce flourished most; the period in which the intellectual superiority of Italy among the European nations was most conspicuous. But municipal liberty was gradually lost. The conflicts, in the northern and central cities, between the nobles and the commons, generally issued in the triumph of the latter; but the next step was the grasping of supreme power by a single family. The dominion of a tyrant or lord was built up on the ruins of republicanism. Florence followed the fate of other cities, and fell at last under the rule of the Medici.[1] The division of Italy into states, at the beginning of the fifteenth century — of which Naples, the Papal Kingdom, Florence, Milan, and Venice, were the chief — was favorable to the Reformation. There was no one central government with power to crush the new opinions.

[1] On the condition of Italy in the 15th century, see Sismondi, *Hist. d. Républ. Ital. d. Moyen Age*, vii. ch. x.; Hallam, *Europe during the Middle Ages*, ch. iii., p. ii.

It might be possible for those who were persecuted in one city to flee into another. On the other hand, the decline of the spirit of liberty, which took place in the age before the Reformation, the brilliant age of literature and art, was an inauspicious event.

Italy was a near spectator of the venality and profligacy of the Roman curia, and the victim in the strife that was kindled by the ambition of the pontiffs to extend their temporal dominion and to aggrandize their relatives. The rebukes that were thundered from the pulpit of Savonarola were not stripped of their influence in consequence of his death, for which the enmity of Alexander VI. was largely responsible. In the Council of the Lateran, in 1512, Ægidius, General of the Augustinian Order, and the Count of Mirandola, among others, denounced the abuses that menaced the Church and religion itself with ruin. The arraignment of the papal administration by the Transalpine reformers would naturally meet with a sympathetic response in Italy. Yet there was a national pride connected with the Papacy; and this sentiment was strengthened by the circumstance that the Papacy was often attacked as an Italian institution, and in a style that was adapted to wound Italian feeling.

As far back as the twelfth century, Arnold of Brescia, inspired by the teachings of Abelard with a love of truth, and catching the spirit which the struggle for municipal liberty was beginning to nourish, demanded that the clergy should renounce their worldly possessions and temporal power, and return to a life of apostolic simplicity. For a time his eloquence carried the day in Rome itself. He perished at last, a martyr to his principles.[1] The follies and vices of the clergy, even the iniquitous doings of Popes, had been castigated by Italian writers from the dawn of the vernacular literature. The lofty and bitter invectives of Dante are aimed at the temporal ambition and at particular misdeeds of incumbents of the Holy See. At the very opening of the "Inferno," he paints the existing Church, clothed with temporal power, as: —

> "A she-wolf, that with all hungerings,
> Seemed to be laden in her meagerness,
> And many folk has caused to live forlorn."[2]

[1] For the literature respecting Arnold of Brescia, see Deutsch's article in Hauck's *Realencyklopädie*, ii. 117.

[2] *Inferno*, i. 49–51.

Pope Anastasius he charges with heresy and places among the lost;[1] Pope Celestine V., for abdicating the papal chair to give room for Boniface VIII., lies at the mouth of hell among those whom mercy and justice both disdain;[2] and Boniface himself expiates his crimes in a deeper abyss of perdition.[3] The Popes had turned from shepherds into wolves, and, neglecting the Gospels and the Fathers, had only conned the Decretals: —

"Their meditations reach not Nazareth."[4]

Manfred, the son of the Emperor Frederic II., died excommunicate; but in Purgatory he was found having the promise of everlasting happiness: —

"By malison of theirs is not so lost
Eternal love, that it cannot return,
So long as hope has anything of green."[5]

But Dante receives the dogmas of the Church; his whole work is cast in the mold of the traditional theology; he places in the joys of Paradise, in "the heaven of the sun," Aquinas Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Peter Lombard, and the other great lights of orthodoxy.[6] Heresiarchs groan under a doom from which there is no deliverance.[7] It is the abominations in the conduct of ecclesiastics, and especially their seizure of worldly dominion, with the wealth and pride which accompany it, that move the solemn poet's ire. Against this temporal rule and party spirit of his successors, St. Peter inveighs in Paradise. He exclaims: —

"In garb of shepherds the rapacious wolves
Are seen from here above o'er all the pastures."[8]

Dante's ideal is the empire restored to universal rule and having its seat in Italy. This theory of a monarchy is the subject of his political treatise.[9] Petrarch takes the same general position,

[1] *Ibid.*, xi. 8.
[2] *Ibid.*, iii. 59.
[3] *Ibid.*, xix. 53.
[4] *Paradiso*, ix. 137.
[5] *Purgatorio*, iii.133–135.
[6] *Paradiso*, x. 98, 99, 107; xii. 127.
[7] *Inferno*, x.
[8] *Paradiso*, xxvii. 55–56.

[9] A class of critics have unsuccessfully attempted to show that Dante was really hostile to the spiritual sovereignty of the Popes. One theory is that the principal poets of that age belonged to secret anti-sacerdotal associations. This theory is advocated by Gabriele Rossetti: *Sullo Spirito antipapale che produsse la Reforma*, etc., translated into English by Miss Ward (London, 1834). Among the instructive works upon Dante is that of Prof. V. Botta, *Dante as Philosopher, Patriot, and Poet*, New York, 1865. A valuable list of works on Dante, some of which relate directly to his theology, is given by Prof. Abegg in his Essay, *Die Idee der Gerechtigkeit u. die strafrechtlichen Grundsätze in Dante's göttl. Comödie*, in the *Jahrb. d. deutschen Dante-Gesellschaft*, i., p. 180, n. See also Prof. J. R. Lowell's learned article on Dante, *N. A. Review*, July, 1872.

although his denunciations of the pollution of the papal curia, the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse, surpass in intensity the most fiery declamation of Protestants in later times. Boccaccio goes a step farther. His treatment of the Church, had we no other knowledge of him than what the "Decamerone" affords, would even lead to the conclusion that he had no reverence for its teaching. Ecclesiastical persons are made to figure in ludicrous and scandalous situations. One of his tales, for example, is the story of a Jew whom a friend endeavored to convert to the Christian faith. The Jew resolves to go from Paris to Rome in order to see Christianity at its headquarters — a purpose that strikes with dismay his Christian friend, who doubts not that the iniquitous lives of the Pope, of his cardinals and court, will chase from the Jew's mind all thoughts of conversion. But in due time he comes back a Christian believer, and explains to his astonished friend that the spectacle which he had beheld in the capital of Christianity had convinced him that the Christian religion must have a supernatural origin and divine support; else it would have been driven out of the world by the profligacy and folly of its guardians.[1]

It is generally conceded that after the time of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, the passionate study of the ancients, which these great writers had fostered, suspended in a remarkable degree the development of Italian literature, in the path of original production.[2] The Renaissance was antiquarian and critical in its spirit. All that could be done for a long time was to count and weigh the treasures of antiquity which enthusiastic explorers discovered within the walls of monasteries, or brought from the East. The revival of letters led to the exposure of fictions, like the pretended donation of Constantine, which Laurentius Valla, whom Bellarmine called a precursor of the Lutherans, disproved in a treatise that produced a general excitement. The skeptical tone of Italian Humanism reduced to a low point the authority of the Church among the cultivated class. But the Humanists seldom possessed the heroic quali-

[1] This jest is reproduced in a different shape by Voltaire, who says of "our religion": "It is unquestionably divine, since seventeen centuries of imposture and imbecility have not destroyed it." Quoted by Morley, *Voltaire*, p. 305. On Boccaccio's treatment of ecclesiastics and of religion, see Ginguené, *Hist. Littéraire d'Italie*, iii. 120 seq.

[2] Sismondi, *Hist. View of the Lit. of the South of Europe*, i. 306.

ties of character which qualified them to endure suffering for the cause of truth. The love of fame, a passion which the Christian spirit in the Middle Ages had kept in check, reappeared, in an excessive measure, in the devotees of pagan literature. They burned incense to the great on whom they depended for patronage and advancement, but carried into their disputes with one another an acrimony and fierceness without previous example. Poggio, one of the principal men of letters in the first half of the fifteenth century, infused into his polemical writings a ferocity which is only less repulsive than the gross obscenity that defiles other works from his pen.[1] The Italian Humanists did a vast work of a negative sort in sweeping away superstition, and in undermining the credit of ecclesiastics and of their dogmas. Their positive services in behalf of a more enlightened religion are of less account. Yet good fruit often grew out of the attention that was given to the Scriptures.[2] Academies, or private literary associations, sprang up in the principal cities; and in them theological topics were discussed with freedom. The widespread culture formed a soil in which the seed of the new doctrine, under favorable circumstances, might germinate.[3]

At an early day, the writings of Luther and of the other Reformers were widely disseminated in Italy. Both Luther and Zwingli had their correspondents there. The writings were circulated anonymously or under fictitious names, and thus eluded the vigilance of the ecclesiastical authorities.[4] The war

[1] Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letteratura Ital.*, vi. 1027 seq. On Poggio, see also Hallam, *Intr. to the Lit. of Europe*, i. 66. Shepherd, *Life of Poggio*, p. 460. Shepherd says of his indecency and levity, that they were "rather vices of the times than of the man."

[2] Upon the moral and religious tone, as well as upon the other characteristics of the Renaissance, there are interesting statements in Burckhardt, *Die Cultur d. Renaissance in Italien* (Basel, 1860). An excellent sketch of the Renaissance in Italy, in its various features, is given by Gregorovius, *Geschichte d. Stadt Rom. im Mittelalter*, vol. VII. c. vi. (Stuttgart, 1870).

[3] Gerdesius, *Specimen Italiæ Reformatæ* (Lugd. Bat., 1765). An excellent work on the Reformation in Italy is that of Dr. McCrie, *History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy* (new edition, 1856). This, together with the *History of the Reformation in Spain*, by the same author, are among the most valuable of the monographs relating to the period of the Reformation. Ranke, *History of the Popes of Rome during the 16th and 17th Centuries* (the sequel of an earlier work, *Die Fürsten u. Völker von sudl. Europa*), presents much additional matter of extreme value.

[4] Melancthon's *Loci Communes* were printed at Venice, the name of the author being given on the title page, as *Ippofilo da Terra Nigra*, McCrie, p. 23. See also Cantu, *Storia della Lett. Ital.*, p. 287.

between Charles V. and the Pope, that broke out in 1526, brought a host of Lutheran soldiers into Italy, many of whom, after the sack of Rome, remained long at Naples. Not only by their direct influence, but by the freedom which their presence occasioned during the progress of hostilities, the new doctrine was disseminated. The Augustinian theology took root in many minds and produced a greater or less sympathy with the Protestant movement. The peculiarity in the case of Italy, and, still more, of Spain, is, that Protestantism could not avow itself without being instantly smothered. Decided Protestantism could not live except in concealment. Protestant worshipers could exist only as secret societies. In considering the Reformation in these countries, we must take into view the real but unavowed Protestantism; and also the leanings toward the Protestant system which were not sufficient to prompt to a renunciation of the old Church, or were repressed before they could ripen into full convictions. There were some who only hoped for the removal of the corruption that existed in the papal court and throughout the Catholic Church. Another class sympathized with the Reformers in matters of doctrine, especially on the subject of Justification, but were not disposed to alter materially the existing polity or forms of worship. Still another class were deterred by timidity, or lack of earnestness, or some more commendable motive, from declaring in favor of the Protestant system which they, at heart, adopted.[1] Protestantism in Italy was thus a thing of degrees; and in its earlier stages developed itself in connection with tendencies which diverged into the reactionary, defensive, and aggressive force to which the Catholic Church owed its restoration.

Before the death of Leo X., a reverent, devotional spirit, opposed to the skeptical and epicurean tone of society, manifested itself among a class of educated Italians. Fifty or sixty persons united at Rome in what they called the Oratory of Divine Love, and held meetings for worship and mutual edification. Among them were men who afterwards reached the highest distinction, but were destined to separate from one another in their views of Reform: Caraffa, Contarini, Sadolet, Giberto, all of whom were subsequently made cardinals. The common bond among them was the earnest desire for the re-

[1] McCrie, p. 102.

moval of abuses, and for the moral reformation of the Church in its head and members. Contarini may be considered the head of those who espoused a doctrine of Justification, not materially distinguished from that of Luther. With him were found, a few years later, at Venice, besides former associates, Flaminio, a thorough believer in the evangelical idea of gratuitous salvation, and Reginald Pole, who adopted the same opinion. This party of Evangelical Catholics were devoted to the Catholic Church, and to the unity of it. Their aim was to purify the existing body; but in their views of the great doctrine, which formed the original ground of controversy, they stood in a position to meet and conciliate the Protestants. Their doctrine of Justification, bringing with it a greater or less inclination to other doctrinal changes in keeping with it, spread among the intelligent classes throughout Italy.

In Ferrara, the reformed opinions were encouraged and protected by Renée or Renata, the wife of Hercules II., who was equally distinguished for her learning and her personal attractions. At her Court the French poet, Clement Marot, found a refuge; and here Calvin resided for some months, under an assumed name. Among the professors in the University at Ferrara was Morata, the father of the celebrated Olympia Morata, and, like her, imbued with evangelical opinions. At Modena, which was renowned for the culture of its inhabitants, the new doctrine found a hospitable reception; especially among the members of the academy, who looked with contempt on the priests and monks. Cardinal Morone, the Bishop of Modena, who had been absent in Germany on missions from the Pope, writes, in 1542, "Wherever I go, and from all quarters, I hear that the city has become Lutheran." [1] In Florence, though it was the seat of the Medici, and furnished in this age two Popes, Leo X. and Clement VII., many embraced the Protestant faith. Among them was Brucioli, who published, at Venice, a translation of the Scriptures, and a commentary on the whole Bible. Not less than three translators of the Bible in this period were born at Florence. At Bologna, Mollio, a celebrated teacher in the University, after the year 1533, taught the Protestant views on Justification and other points, until he was removed from his office by order of the Pope. Subse-

[1] McCrie, p. 54.

quently, through a letter to the Protestants of Bologna, from Bucer, and through another letter from them, we learn that they were numerous. Venice, where printing and the book trade flourished, and where the internal police was less severe than elsewhere, offered the best advantages both for the safe reception and active diffusion of the reformed doctrines. "You give me joy," said Luther, in 1528, "by what you write of the Venetians receiving the word of God." Later prosecutions for heresy there were multiplied. Pietro Carnesecchi, who afterwards died for his faith, Lupetino, provincial of the Franciscans, who also perished as a martyr, and Baldassare Altieri, who acted as agent of the Protestant princes in Germany, were among the most efficient in diffusing the Protestant opinions.[1] Padua, Verona, and other places within the Venetian territory likewise furnished adherents of the new faith. The same was true of the Milanese, where the contiguity to Switzerland, and the political changes in the duchy, opened avenues for the introduction of heresy.

In Naples, Juan Valdés, a Spaniard, Secretary of the Viceroy of Charles V., was an eloquent and influential supporter of the evangelical doctrine, and won to the full or partial adoption of it many persons of distinction; including, it is thought, Vittoria Colonna and other members of the Colonna family.[2] His devout mysticism recommended him as a religious guide to many who did not give their usual attendance at the Churches. In many other places, a good beginning was made in the same direction. Not a few among the numerous gifted and cultivated women in that age, when zeal for the study of the ancient authors had become a pervading passion, were attracted to the evangelical doctrine. This doctrine gained many converts among the middle classes. In a decree of the Inquisition, three thousand schoolmasters were said to have espoused it. Caraffa informed Paul III. that "the whole of Italy was infected with the Lutheran heresy, which had been extensively embraced both by statesmen and ecclesiastics."[3] "Whole libraries," says Melancthon,

[1] McCrie, p. 64.

[2] See the learned article on Valdés by Dr. Ed. Böhmer, in Herzog, *Real-encycl. d. Theol.* There were two brothers, Alfonso and Juan. Alfonso was also favorable to the Reformation. Dr. Böhmer presents a full description of the writings and opinions of Juan Valdés.

[3] Quoted by McCrie, p. 113.

in a letter written probably in 1540, "have been carried from the late fair into Italy." There is no doubt that the evangelical doctrine was favorably regarded by a large body of educated persons, for it was almost exclusively among these that it found sympathy. The most eminent preacher in Italy, Bernardino Ochino, General of the Capuchins, who drew crowds of admiring auditors at Venice, and wherever else he appeared in the pulpit, and Peter Martyr Vermigli, an honored member of the Augustinian order, who was hardly less distinguished, and a much abler theologian, were of this number. Chiefly owing to the labors of Martyr, Lucca had, perhaps, more converts to the evangelical faith than any other Italian city. The little treatise on the "Benefits of Christ," which was composed, not by Paleario, but by a disciple of Valdés, Benedetto of Mantua, was circulated in thousands of copies. Paleario wrote a book of like purport, on the sufficiency and efficacy of the death of Christ.[1] We have the testimony of Pope Clement VII. to the wide prevalence, in different parts of Italy, of "the pestiferous heresy of Luther," not only among secular persons, but also among the clergy.[2]

In Venice and Naples, the Reformed Churches were organized with pastors, and held their secret meetings. Unhappily, the Sacramentarian quarrel broke out in the former place, and was aggravated by an intolerant letter of Luther, in which he declared his preference of transubstantiation to the Zwinglian doctrine: a letter which Melancthon, in his epistles to friends, noticed with strong terms of condemnation.

Paul III., who succeeded Clement VII., in 1534, showed himself friendly to the Catholic reforming party. He made Contarini cardinal, and elevated to the same rank Caraffa, Pole, Sadolet, and others, most of whom had belonged to the Oratory of Divine Love, and some of whom were friendly to the Protestant doctrine of salvation. He appointed Commissions of Reform, whose business it was to point out and remove abuses in the Roman curia, such as had excited everywhere just complaint. A commission, to which Sadolet and Caraffa belonged, met at Bologna in 1537, and presented to the Pope a *consilium*,

[1] On the two authors, see the *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. II. pp. 389, 395. Kurtz, *Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch.*, ii. p. 120. Hauck, *Realencyklopädie*, xiv. 601 seq.

[2] McCrie, p. 45.

or opinion, in which they described the abuses in the administration of the Church as amounting to "a pestiferous malady." Their advice was approved by Paul III., and printed by his direction. Ridicule, however, was excited in Germany when it was known that one of the measures recommended by the accomplished Sadolet, in connection with his associates, was the exclusion of the Colloquies of Erasmus from seminaries of learning. The hopes of Contarini and his friends were sanguine; and it seemed not impossible that so great concessions might be made that the Protestants would once more unite themselves with the Church. At the Conference at Ratisbon, in 1541, Contarini appeared as Legate of the Pope, and met, on the other side, Bucer and Melancthon, the most moderate and yielding of all the Protestant leaders. The political situation was such, that the Emperor exerted himself to the utmost to bring about an accommodation between the two parties. On the four great articles, of the nature of man, original sin, redemption and justification, they actually came to an agreement. The Primacy of the Pope, and the Eucharist, were the two great points that remained. But the project of union met with opposition from various quarters. Francis I. raised an outcry against it, as a surrender of the Catholic faith, his motive being the fear of augmenting the power of Charles. Luther was dissatisfied with the platform, on account of its want of definiteness, and had no confidence in the practicableness of a union. On the opposite side, the same feeling manifested itself: Caraffa did not approve of the terms of the agreement which Contarini had sanctioned, especially in regard to justification, and Paul III. took the same view. There was jealousy of Charles at Rome: all of his enemies combined against the scheme. Thus the great project fell to the ground.

This event marks the division of the Catholic reforming party. Caraffa, while severe and earnest in his demand for practical reforms which should purify the administration of the Church, from the Pope downwards, was sternly and inflexibly hostile to every modification of the dogmatic system. He stood forth as the representative and leader of those who were resolved to defend to the last the polity and dogmas of the Church, against all innovation, while at the same time they aimed to infuse a spirit of strict and even ascetic purity and zeal into all its officers,

from the highest to the lowest. It was this party that revived the tone of the Catholic Church, rallied its disorganized forces, and turned upon its adversaries with a renewed and formidable energy.

There were two principal instruments by which this internal renovation and aggressive movement of the Catholic Church were accomplished. These were the rise of new orders, especially the order of Jesuits; and the Council of Trent.

A revival of zeal in the Catholic Church has always been signalized by the appearance of new developments of the monastic spirit. In truth, monasticism arose at the outset from a feeling of weariness and disgust at the worldliness which had invaded the Church. When the societies under the Benedictine rule lapsed from their strictness of discipline and purity of life, new fraternities, as that of Clugni, sprang up, in which monastic simplicity and severity were restored. As these in turn felt the enervating influence of wealth, the great mendicant orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, were established, the offspring of a more earnest spirit. One palpable sign of the resuscitation of the Catholic body was the formation of new monastic fraternities, like the Theatines, who were organized under the auspices of Caraffa — priests with monastic vows, who did not call themselves monks, however, and adopted no austerities which interfered with their practical labors in preaching, administering the sacraments, and tending the sick. Their fervid addresses from the pulpit were the more impressive from the knowledge which their auditors had of their devoted lives. They were gradually transformed into a seminary for the training of priests. But this and other new orders, significant and effective as they were, were soon eclipsed by the more renowned and influential Society of Jesus. Ignatius Loyola, a Spanish soldier of noble birth, blending with the love of his profession something of the religious spirit that had characterized the mediæval chivalry, received in the war against the French, at the siege of Pampeluna, in 1521, wounds in both his legs, which disabled him from military service. In his meditations during his illness, the dreams of chivalry were curiously mingled with devotional aspirations. The glory of St. Dominic, St. Francis, and other heroes of the faith seized on his imagination.[1]

[1] Maffeius, *Ignatii Loiolæ Vita*, ch. ii. (Conversio ejus ad Christum).

More and more the visions of a secular knighthood transformed themselves into visions of a spiritual knighthood under Christ as the Leader. He exchanged the romance of *Amadis* for the lives of the saints. The romantic devotion of a knight to his lady turned into an analogous consecration to the Virgin, before whose image he hung up his lance and shield. Tormented for a long time with remorse and despondency, with alternations of peace and joy, he at length found relief in the conviction that his gloomy feelings were inspirations of the evil spirit, and therefore to be trampled under foot and cast out. He did not escape from his mental distress, as Luther did, by resting on the Word of God and the revealed method of forgiveness, but in a way more consonant with the singular characteristics of his mind.[1] The legal system of the Middle Ages had always produced a yearning for rapturous, ecstatic experiences, which might afford that inward assurance of salvation which the accepted theory of Justification could not yield. At Paris, where Ignatius went to study theology, he brought completely under his influence his two companions, Faber and Francis Xavier. In a cell of the College of St. Barbara, the first steps were taken in the formation of this powerful and celebrated society. Three other Spaniards joined the same enthusiastic circle. They took upon them the vow of chastity, swore to spend their lives, if possible, at Jerusalem, in absolute poverty, in the care of Christians, or in efforts to convert the Saracens; or, if this should not be permitted them, they engaged to offer themselves to the Pope, to be sent wherever he should wish, and to do whatever he should command. In Venice they were ordained as priests, and here it became evident that the appointed theater of their labors was Europe, and not the East. In 1540 their order was sanctioned; in 1543, unconditionally. They chose Ignatius for their President. The new order was exempt from those monastic exercises which consume the time of monks generally, and was left free for practical labors. These were principally preaching, hearing confession, and directing individual consciences, and the education of youth, a part of their work which they regarded, from the beginning, as in the highest degree essential. The "Spiritual Exercises" of Ignatius was the text-book, on which

[1] Ranke, *History of the Popes*, i. 183.

the inward life of the members was molded, and which served as a guide in the management of the confessional. The absolute detaching of the soul from the world, and from all its objects of desire, and the absolute renunciation of self, are cardinal elements in the spiritual drill set forth in this manual, in four main divisions. It is a course of severe and prolonged introspection, and of forced, continuous attention to certain themes of thought; the design of the whole being to bind the will immovably in the path of religious consecration. This effect is produced by exciting, and, at the same time, subjugating the imagination. It is the narratives, not the doctrines, of the Gospel, to which the mind is riveted in prolonged contemplation. The aim is to give to the mental perceptions the vividness of external vision. Ignatius carries the "reign of the senses within the sphere of the soul." To the imaginative piety of the Middle Ages, that reveled in ecstasies and raptures, he gives a systematic form, a definite direction. The effect of a discipline like this, where reason gives up the throne to imagination, which is ever excited and at the same time enslaved, could not be otherwise than deleterious upon the moral nature. Yet there is a wide contrast between the Jesuitism of Loyola and the degenerate Jesuitism depicted in the "Provincial Letters." [1]

The compact organization of the Society of Jesus, with its three grades of membership, included provisions for mutual oversight of such a character that the General even, notwithstanding his well-nigh unlimited power, might be admonished, and, on adequate grounds, deposed from his station. The one comprehensive obligation to which the members were bound was that of instant, unquestioning, unqualified obedience. To go where they were sent, if it were to a tribe of savages in the remotest part of the globe; to do what they were bidden, without delay and without a murmur, in a spirit of absolute self-surrender, "utque cadaver," was the primal duty. Such was the origin and general character of the Society which was destined to wield an incalculable influence in resuscitating Catholicism, as well as in weakening, and, in some quarters, annihilating the power of its adversaries.

The second of the great agencies of Catholic renovation was

[1] Martin, *Hist. of France*, viii. 205.

the Tridentine Council.[1] For a long period, the project of a Council, which was a favorite one with the Reformers for some time, and which the Emperor insisted on, was repugnant in the highest degree to the wishes of the Popes. A general council was their dread. It was something, however, which it was more and more difficult to avoid. The spread of heresy, even in Italy, was one motive which made Paul III. willing to convoke such an assembly. The Council of Trent was formally opened in December, 1545. The great question was whether it should begin with the reform of the Papacy, or with definitions of dogma. In other words, what attitude should the Council take towards the Protestants? A conciliatory or antagonistic one? Caraffa was sustained in his policy by the Jesuits. The papal influence predominated, and having defined the sources of knowledge of Revealed Religion in terms that left the authority of tradition unimpaired, with anathemas against the Protestant doctrine of the exclusive authority of the Scriptures, the Council proceeded to condemn the Protestant doctrine of Justification, disregarding the arguments of the evangelical Catholic party of Contarini, which was effectively represented in the debate. The success which Charles V. was gaining in the Smalcaldic war emboldened the ruling party at Trent to assert the old dogmas without abatement or concession. The theory of gradual justification and of merit was followed by an equally positive assertion of the old doctrine of the Sacraments. The history of the Council is inseparably connected with the relations of the Pope to Charles V. The fullness of the Emperor's triumph, so much beyond the desires of Paul III., led to an attempt by him to transfer the Council to Bologna; and the jealousy that was felt on account of the greatness of the power acquired by Charles at the end of the war, and on

[1] The history of the Council of Trent has been written by two authors of an opposite temper, Father Paul Sarpi, an enemy of the papal power, and Pallavicini, its defender and apologist. Ranke has subjected these important works to a searching criticism and comparison, in the Appendix (§ ii.) of the *History of the Popes*. He says: "Both of them are complete partizans, and are deficient in the spirit of an historian, which seizes upon circumstances and objects in their full truth, and brings them distinctly to view. Sarpi had the power to do so, but his only aim was to attack; Pallavicini had infinitely less of the requisite talent, and his object was to defend his party at all hazards." Of Sarpi, Ranke observes again: "The authorities are brought together with diligence, are well handled, and used with consummate talent: we cannot say that they are falsified, or that they are frequently or materially altered; but the whole work is colored with a tinge of decided enmity to the Papal power."

account of the Interim and the rest of his schemes of pacification, defeated the ends which the Emperor had hoped to accomplish. Not to pursue the subject into its details, the result of all of the negotiations and struggles of the Council was that the papal power escaped without curtailment. Efforts to reduce the prerogatives of the Pope were ingeniously baffled. The *Professio Fidei,* or brief formula of subscription to the Tridentine Creed, contained a promise of obedience to the Pope. To this formulary all ecclesiastics and teachers are required to give their assent. The Roman Catechism was prepared and published under the direction of the Pope, by the authority of the Council; the Vulgate, which had been declared authoritative in controversies, was issued in an authorized edition, and a Breviary and a Missal put forth for universal use. The Council of Trent did a great work for the education of the clergy, the better organization of the whole hierarchical body, and the discipline of the Church. Its canons of reform regulated the duties of the secular and regular priesthood, inculcated the obligations of bishops, and introduced a new order and efficiency in the management of parishes.

The Creed of Trent was definite and intelligible in its denial of the distinguishing points of Protestantism; but on the questions in dispute between Augustinian and semi-Pelagian parties in the Church, it was indefinite and studiously ambiguous. But the Council, both by its doctrinal formulas and its reformatory canons, contributed very much to the consolidation of the Church in a compact body. It was no longer necessary to seek for the standard of orthodoxy in the various and conflicting writings of fathers and schoolmen, or in the multiplied declarations of the Popes. Such a standard was now presented in a condensed form and with direct reference to the antagonistic doctrines of the time.

But there was another agency of a different character, which was set in motion for the purpose of eradicating heresy. This was the Inquisition. It was reorganized in Italy on the recommendation of Caraffa, by Paul III. in 1542, as the Holy Office for the Universal Church. Caraffa was placed at the head of it; and in 1555 the prime author and the stern chief of this tribunal became Pope under the name of Paul IV. The Inquisition was an institution which had its origin in the early

days of the thirteenth century, for the extirpation of the Albigensian heresy. It is a court, the peculiarity of which lies in the fact that it is expressly constituted for the detection and punishment of heretics, and supersedes, wholly or in part, in the discharge of this function, the bishops or ordinary authorities of the Church. It is thus an extraordinary tribunal, with its own rules and methods of proceeding, its own modes of eliciting evidence. The Spanish Inquisition, in its peculiar form, was set up under Ferdinand and Isabella, in the first instance for the purpose of discovering and punishing the converts from Judaism who returned to their former creed. The atrocities of which it was guilty under Torquemada make a dark and bloody page of Spanish history.[1] It grew into an institution coextensive with the kingdom, with an extremely tyrannical and cruel system of administration; and was so interwoven with the civil government, after the humbling of the nobles and the destruction of liberty in the cities, that the despotic rule of Charles V. and of Philip II. could hardly have been maintained without it. It was an engine for stifling sedition as well as heresy. Hence it was defended by the Spanish sovereigns against objections and complaints of the Popes. The Inquisition, in the form which it assumed in Italy, under the auspices of Caraffa, differed from the corresponding institution

[1] Llorente, *Hist. Critique de l' Inquisition d' Espagne* (1817–18). Llorente was Secretary of the Inquisition, and having had the best opportunities for the investigation of its history, spent several years in the preparation of his work. The French translation of Pellier was made under the author's eye. Llorente was a liberal priest, in sympathy with the aims of the French Revolution, and a supporter of the Bonaparte rule in Spain. He believed the Inquisition to be "vicious in its principle, in its constitution, and in its laws" (Pref., p. x.), and he had no special reverence for the Popes. Yet at the time of the composition of this work, his relation to the Catholic Church was not, as it afterwards became, antagonistic. The work of Llorente has been unfavorably criticised by Roman Catholic writers, especially by Hefele, *Der Cardinal Ximenes*, etc. (2d ed., 1851), p. 241 seq. Hefele insists, in the first place, that the Spanish Inquisition was predominantly an instrument of the government, and that the Popes endeavored to check the severities of the Holy Office; and, secondly, that the charges of cruelty brought against the Inquisition have been greatly exaggerated. Hefele's principal point is Llorente's alleged miscalculation of the number of victims of the Inquisition. It is to be observed that most of his animadversions upon Llorente, Hefele is obliged to sustain by information which Llorente himself furnishes. Hefele considers that Prescott has erred in some particulars, through the influence of Llorente. Prescott's account of the Inquisition is in his *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, I. ch. vii. Hefele has much to say of the disposition of the Jews to make proselytes, which he considers a palliation of the course taken by the Inquisition. But the vast number of insincere Jewish converts to Christianity, who furnished business to the Inquisition, proves that the "proselyten-macherei" was not so much on the side of the Jews.

in Spain, in some respects, but it resembled the latter in superseding the ordinary tribunals for the exercise of discipline, and was founded on the same general principles. Six cardinals were made inquisitors general, with power to constitute inferior tribunals, and with authority, on both sides of the Alps, to incarcerate and try all suspected persons of whatever rank or order. The terrible machinery of this court was at once set in motion in the States of the Church, and although resistance was offered in Venice and in other parts of Italy, the Inquisition gradually extended its active sway over the whole peninsula. The result was that the open profession of Protestantism was instantly suppressed. The Popes after Caraffa, especially Sixtus V., increased its powers and the number of its officials. In 1542, prior to the formal establishment of the Holy Office, Ochino and Peter Martyr, unwilling longer to conceal their adhesion to the Protestant faith, and being no longer safe in Italy, had left their country and found refuge with the Protestants north of the Alps. Equal amazement was occasioned when, in 1548, Vergerio, bishop of Capo d'Istria, a man of distinction, who had been employed in important embassies by the Pope, followed their example. A multitude of suspected persons fled to the Grisons and to other parts of Switzerland. The academies at Modena and elsewhere were broken up. The Duchess of Ferrara was compelled to part from all of her Protestant friends and dependents, and was herself subjected to constraint by her husband. The Protestant church of Locarno was driven out, under circumstances of great hardship, and found an asylum in Switzerland. Imprisonment, torture, and the flames were everywhere employed for the destruction of heterodox opinions. At Venice the practice was to take the unhappy victim out upon the sea at midnight and to place him on a plank, between two boats, which were rowed in opposite directions, leaving him to sink beneath the waves. Many distinguished men were banished; others, as Aonio Paleario and Carnesecchi, were put to death. The Waldensian settlement in Calabria was barbarously massacred. One essential part of the work of the Inquisition, and a part in which it attained to surprising success, was the suppression of heretical books. The booksellers were obliged to purge their stock to an extent that was almost ruinous to their business. So vigilant was the

detective police of the Inquisition, that of the thousands of copies of the evangelical book on the "Benefits of Christ," it was long supposed that not one was left.[1] In a more recent period some surviving copies have come to light. As a part of the repressive system of Caraffa, the "Index" of prohibited books was established. Besides the particular authors and books which were condemned, there was a list of more than sixty printers, all of whose publications were prohibited. Caraffa put upon the Index the *Consilium* or *Advice*, which in connection with Sadolet and others he himself had offered to Paul III., on the subject of a reformation, and in which ecclesiastical abuses had been freely censured.[2] Later, under the auspices of Sixtus V., the "Index Expurgatorius" arose, for the condemnation, not of entire works, but of particular passages in permitted books. The sweeping persecution which was undertaken by the Catholic Reaction did not spare the evangelical Catholics, whose views of Justification were obnoxious to the faction that had gained the ascendency. They were regarded and treated as little better than avowed enemies of the Church. Even Cardinal Pole, who had forsaken England rather than accede to the measures of Henry VIII., and had been made Papal Legate and Archbishop of Canterbury under Mary, was in disgrace at the time of his death, which was simultaneous with that of the Queen. Cardinal Morone, the Archbishop of Modena, charged with circulating Paleario's book on the Atonement, with denying the merit of good works, and with like offenses, was imprisoned for about two years, until the death of Paul IV., in 1559, set him free. The characteristic spirit of the dominant party is seen in the impracticable demand of this Pope that the sequestered property of the monasteries in England should be restored. This party succeeded in virtually extinguishing Protestantism in Italy.

In Spain a literary spirit had early arisen from the influence of the Arabic schools.[3] The Erasmian culture found a cordial

[1] Macaulay, in his *Review of Ranke's History of the Popes* (*Ed. Rev.*, 1840), said of this book, "It is now as hopelessly lost as the second decade of Livy."

[2] For the proof of this, see McCrie, p. 61.

[3] McCrie, *History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Spain in the Sixteenth Century* (new ed., 1856). This work is the companion of the *History of the Reformation in Italy*, and of scarcely less value.

reception. There grew up an Erasmian and an anti-Erasmian Party. "The Complutensian Polyglot" was an edition of the Scriptures that reflects much credit upon Cardinal Ximenes, by whom it was issued. He not only was active in the reform of the monks and clergy; he was a patron of scholars. Yet, he was opposed to rendering the Bible into the vernacular of the people, and was a supporter of the Inquisition. The resentment which this odious tribunal awakened, wherever a love of freedom lingered, predisposed some to the acceptance of the doctrine which it persecuted. The intercourse with Germany and the Netherlands, into which many Spaniards, both laymen and clergy, were brought from the common relation of these countries to Charles V., made the Protestant doctrines familiar to many, of whom not a few regarded them with favor. It was observed that Spanish ecclesiastics who sojourned in England after the marriage of Philip II. to Mary, came back to their country, tinged with the heresy which they had gone forth to oppose. The war of Charles V. against Clement VII., which led to the sack of Rome and the imprisonment of the Pontiff, and the presence of a great body of Spanish clergy and nobles at the Diet of Augsburg, where the Protestants presented their noble confession, were events not without a favorable influence in the same direction. As early as 1519 the famous printer of Basel, John Froben, sent to Spain a collection of Luther's tracts in Latin, and during the next year the Reformer's commentary on the Galatians, in which his doctrine was fully exhibited, was translated into Spanish. Spanish translations of the Bible were printed at Antwerp and Venice, and notwithstanding the watchfulness of the Inquisition, copies of them, as well as other publications of the Protestants, were introduced into Spain in large numbers. Some Spaniards perished abroad, martyrs to the Protestant faith; as Jayme Enzinas, a cultivated scholar, who was burned at Rome in 1546, and Juan Diaz, who was assassinated in Germany by a fanatical brother, who had tried in vain to convert him, and who, having accomplished his act of bloody fratricide, escaped into Italy and was protected from punishment. It was at Seville and Valladolid that Protestantism obtained most adherents. Those who adopted the reformed interpretation of the Gospel generally contented themselves with promulgating it, without an open attack on the Catholic

theology or the Church. It was the doctrine of justification by faith alone which, here as in Italy, gained most currency. In Seville the evangelical views were introduced by Rodrigo de Valero, a man of rank and fashion, whose character had been transformed by the reception of them, and who promulgated them in conversation and in expositions of the Scripture to private circles. He was saved from the flames only by the favor of persons in authority, but was imprisoned in a convent. The most eminent preachers of the city, Dr. John Egidius, and Constantine Ponce de la Fuente, who had been chaplain of the Emperor, enlisted in the new movement. The predominant opinion in Seville was on the side of this real, though covert, Protestantism. It found a reception, also, in cloisters of the city, especially in one belonging to the Hieronymites. Both in Seville and Valladolid there were secret churches, fully organized, and meeting in privacy for Protestant worship. In Valladolid the Protestant cause had a distinguished leader in the person of Augustine Cazalla, the Imperial chaplain, who was put to death by the Inquisition in 1559. There were probably two thousand persons in various parts of Spain who were united in the Protestant faith and held private meetings for a number of years. A large proportion of them were persons distinguished for their rank or learning. The discovery of these secret associations at Seville and Valladolid stimulated the Inquisition to redoubled exertions. The flight of many facilitated the detection of others who remained. The dungeons were filled and the terrible implements of torture were used to extort confessions not only from men, but from refined and delicately trained women. In 1559 and 1560, two great *autos da fé* were held in the two cities where heresy had taken the firmest root. The ceremonies were arranged with a view to strike terror to the hearts of the sufferers themselves and of the great throngs that gathered as spectators of the scene. The condemned were burned alive, those who would accept the offices of a priest, however, having the privilege of being strangled before their bodies were cast into the fire. The King and royal family, the great personages of the court, of both sexes, gave countenance to the proceedings by their presence. Similar *autos da fé* occurred in various other places, with every circumstance calculated to inspire fear in the beholders. The officers of the

Inquisition were so active and vigilant, and so merciless, that there was no hope for any who were inclined to Protestant opinions, save in flight; and even this was difficult. Covetousness allied itself to fanaticism, for the forfeiture of all property was a part of the penalty invariably visited upon heresy. Thus Protestantism was eradicated.[1] The restraints laid upon liberty of teaching smothered the intellectual life of the country.

In Spain, as in Italy, the persecution did not spare the Evangelical Catholics. Among these was Bartolomé de Carranza, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain, who had stood among the advocates of gratuitous justification at the Council of Trent. He had accompanied Philip II. to England and taken part in examining Protestants who perished at the stake under Mary. He was denounced to the Inquisition and imprisoned at Valladolid. His intimacy with Pole, and with Morone, Flaminio, and other eminent Italians who were inclined to evangelical doctrine, was one fact brought up against him. His catechism, partly for its alleged leaning, in some points, to the Lutheran theology, and partly because it was written in the vulgar tongue, was the principal basis of the accusation. He was charged with not having accused before the Holy Office leading Spanish Protestants, of whose sentiments he had privately expressed his disapprobation. At the end of seven years he was taken to Rome, and after various delays, Gregory XIII., in 1576, pronounced sentence, finding him violently suspected of heresy, prohibiting his catechism, requiring him to abjure sixteen Lutheran articles, and suspending him from his office for five years. At the expiration of this time, after having been for eighteen years under some species of confinement, he died. A part of the material of accusation against Carranza was derived from the words of consolation which he had addressed to the dying Emperor, Charles V., at the convent of Yuste. Kneeling at his bedside, the Archbishop, holding up a crucifix, exclaimed: "Behold Him who answers for all! There is no more sin; all is forgiven!" His words gave offense to some who were present. Villabra, the Emperor's favorite preacher, who followed, reminded his royal master that as he was born on the day of St.

[1] For details of persecution, see De Castros, *Spanish Protestants* (London, 1851),

Matthew, so he was to die on that of St. Matthias. With such intercessors, it was added, he had nothing to fear. "Thus," writes Mignet, "the two doctrines that divided the world in the age of Charles V., were once more brought before him on the bed of death." [1] Besides the Archbishop of Toledo, not less than eight Spanish bishops, of whom the most had sat in the Council of Trent, and twenty-five doctors of theology, among whom were persons of the highest eminence for learning, were likewise arraigned, and most of them obliged to make some retraction or submit to some public humiliation.

It is a remarkable evidence of the vitality of the Catholic reaction that it went forward in spite of the want of active sympathy on the part of certain Popes with its favorite measures, or the inconsistency of their policy with its spirit and aims. What the new movement required, and the result towards which it tended was the union of the Catholic powers; especially an alliance of the Pope and Spain. When Caraffa at the age of seventy-nine ascended the papal throne, his strongest passion seemed to be his hatred of Charles V. and the Spaniards. With all his zeal for the reform of which he had been one of the earliest promoters, he advanced his relatives to high stations, not from that selfish ambition from which nepotism had previously sprung, but in order to carry out his schemes of hostility to Spain. His stoutest defenders against Alva were Germans, most of whom were Protestants; he even invoked the help of the Turks. The defeat of his French allies at St. Quentin, followed by the complete success of Alva, forced upon him a change of policy. Forthwith he resumed with absorbing energy his enterprises of reform, and discarded his relations, whom he had found to be treacherous. This was the end of the nepotism which so long had brought disgrace and weakness upon the papal office. But the war that he kindled aided the cause of Protestantism in France and in the Netherlands, and also in England. His political schemes were partly responsible for his arrogant treatment of Elizabeth, whom he did not wish to marry Philip, and whom he did wish Mary Stuart, the candidate of the Guises, to supplant. In Pius IV. (1559–65) we have a pontiff who personally did not sympathize much with the Inquisition, yet left it to pursue its course unhindered. He

[1] Robertson, *Hist. of Charles V.* (Prescott's ed.), iii. 491, 492.

labored to unite the Catholic world, and succeeded in pacifying the divisions in the Council of Trent by skillful negotiations with the different sovereigns. Pius V. (1566–72) was a devoted representative of the rigid party, was zealous on the one hand for the reformation of the papal court, and on the other for the destruction of heretics. He induced Duke Cosmo of Florence to deliver up to him Carnesecchi, an accomplished literary man, who, influenced by Valdés, had early favored Protestantism, and had him brought to Rome, where he was beheaded and his body committed to the flames.[1] He approved of Alva's doings in the Netherlands. Gradually the Papacy came to join hands with Spain in the grand effort to overcome Protestantism. Sixtus V. excommunicated Henry IV. of France (1585). He lent his most earnest coöperation to the effort to conquer England by the Armada. He was heart and soul with Guise and the League, and upon the assassination of Guise, excommunicated Henry III. If he listened favorably to the efforts made to induce him to absolve and recognize Henry of Navarre, his inclinations in this direction were overcome by the energetic remonstrances of Philip.[2] It was the hostile attitude of the Papacy that strongly affected the Catholic adherents of Navarre, and confirmed them in the disposition to require of him a profession of the Catholic faith.

Nothing can be more striking than the change in the intellectual spirit of Italy, as we approach the end of the sixteenth century.[3] The old ardor in the study and imitation of the ancients has passed away. Even the reverence that spared the architectural remains of antiquity is supplanted in the mind of Sixtus V., for example, by the desire to rear edifices that may rival them. A zeal for independent investigation, especially in natural science, takes the place of antiquarian scholarship; but this new scientific spirit, which often took a speculative turn, was checked and repressed by the ecclesiastical rulers. Loyalty to the Church, and a religious temper, in the strict form which the Catholic restoration engendered, penetrated society. Poetry, painting, and music were at once renovated and molded by the religious influence. Tasso, who

[1] McCrie, *Ref. in Italy*, p. 20.

[2] Ranke, *History of the Popes*, i. 387 seq., ii. 128 seq., iii. 115 seq. Hübner, *Life of Sixtus V.* (1872).

[3] *Ibid.*, i. 493.

chose a pious crusader for the hero of his poem, the school of Caracci, Domenichino, and Guido Reni, Palestrina, the great composer, suggest the revolution in public feeling and taste in this age, in contrast with the age of the Renaissance. The papal court, in its restored strictness and sobriety, manifested its entire subjection to the new movement. In a character like Carlo Borromeo, the counter-reformation appears in a characteristic but peculiarly attractive light. Of noble birth, and with temptations to sensual indulgence thrown in his path, he devoted himself to a religious life with unwavering fidelity. The nephew of Pius V., offices of the highest responsibility were forced upon him, which he discharged with so exemplary diligence and faithfulness, that such as were inclined to envy or to censure were compelled to applaud. But he welcomed the day when he could lay them down, and give himself wholly to his diocese of Milan, where he was archbishop. His untiring perseverance in works of charity and reform, his visitations to remote, mountainous villages, in the care of his flock, his zeal for education, his devoutness, caused him to be styled, in the bull that canonized him, an angel in human form. His exertions in making proselytes, and his willingness to persecute heresy, are less agreeable to contemplate; but they were essential features of the Catholic reaction.

The Jesuits first established themselves in force in Italy, and in Portugal, Spain, and their colonies. "Out of the visionary schemes of Ignatius," says Ranke, "arose an institution of singularly practical tendency; out of the conversions wrought by his asceticism, an institution framed with all the just and accurate calculation of worldly prudence." The education of youth, especially those of higher rank, quickly fell, to a large extent, into their hands. Their system of intellectual training was according to a strict method; but their schools were pervaded by their peculiar religious spirit. It was largely through their influence that the profane or secular tone of culture, that had prevailed in the cities of Italy, was superseded by a culture in which reverence for religion and the Church was a vital element. From the two peninsulas the new order extended its influence into the other countries of Europe. They formed a great standing army, in the service of the Pope, for the propagation of Catholicism. The University of Vienna

was placed under their direction; they established themselves at Cologne and Ingolstadt and Prague, and from these centers operated with great success in the Austrian dominions, the Rhenish provinces, and other parts of Germany. The Duke of Bavaria, partly from worldly and partly from religious motives, enlisted warmly in the cause of the Catholic reaction, and made himself its champion. In the ecclesiastical states of Germany, the spirit of Catholicism was reawakened, and the toleration promised to Protestants by the Peace of Augsburg was frequently violated. The Popes, in this period, were liberal in their concessions to the Catholic princes, who found their profit in helping forward the reactionary movement. In the last quarter of the sixteenth century, mainly by the labors of the Jesuits, and by the violent measures which they instigated, the tide was turned against Protestantism in southern Germany, in Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, and Hungary. In these countries, Protestantism had, on the whole, gained the ascendency. Together with Belgium and France, they constituted "the great debatable land," where the two confessions struggled for the mastery. In all of them, Catholicism, with its new forces, was triumphant. The Jesuits did much to promote that increased excitement of Catholic feeling in France, which showed itself in the slaughter of St. Bartholomew and the wars of the League. From Douay, the establishment founded by Cardinal William Allen, they sent out their emissaries into England. The order was active in Sweden, and, for a time, had some prospect of winning that kingdom back to the Catholic fold. Wherever they did not prevail, they sharpened the mutual antagonism of the rival confessions. The progress of the Catholic restoration was aided, especially in Germany, by the quarrels of Protestant theologians. The mutual hostility of Lutheran and Calvinist appeared, in some cases, to outweigh their common opposition to Rome.

The question has often been asked, why, after so rapid an advance of Protestantism for a half-century, a limit should then have been set to its progress? Why was it unable to overstep the bounds which it reached in the first age of its existence? Macaulay has handled this question in a spirited essay, in which, with certain reasons, which are pertinent and valuable, is

coupled a singular denial that the knowledge of religion is progressive, or at all dependent upon the general enlightenment of the human mind. Apart from his paradoxical speculation on this last point, his statement of the grounds of the arrest of the progress of Protestantism, though eloquent and valuable, is quite incomplete. The principal causes of this event we deem to be the following: —

1. The ferment that attended the rise of Protestantism must eventually lead to a crystallizing of parties; and this must raise up a barrier in the way of the further spread of the new doctrine. Protestantism was a movement of reform, arising within the Church. At the outset, multitudes stood, in relation to it, in the attitude of inquirers. They were more or less favorably inclined to it. What course they would take might depend on the influences to which they would happen to be exposed. They were not immovably attached to the old system; they were open to persuasion. But as the conflict became warm, men were more and more prompted to take sides, and to range themselves under one or the other banner. This period of fluctuation and conversion would naturally come to an end. As soon as the spirit of party was thus awakened, it formed an obstacle to the further progress of the new opinions, for this spirit communicated itself from father to son.

2. The political arrangements which were adopted in different countries, in consequence of the religious division, all tended to confine Protestantism within the limits which it had early attained. In Germany, the negotiations and disputes produced by the religious contest, issued in the adoption of the principle, "cujus regio, ejus religio"; the religion of the State shall conform to that of the prince. This principle, however, would not have availed to arrest Protestantism. But the "ecclesiastical reservation" did thus avail, since the conversion of an ecclesiastical ruler to the new faith was attended with no important gain to the Protestant cause: he must vacate his office. The whole tendency of political arrangements in Germany was to build up a wall of separation between the two confessions, and to protect the territory of each from encroachments by the other. It must be remembered that the spirit of propagandism did not, generally speaking, characterize Protestantism. The Protestants, especially in Germany, were

satisfied if they could be left to develop, without interference, their own system. The utmost limit of their demand was room for its natural expansion.[1] In the Netherlands, the separation of the Walloon provinces from the other states, and the adherence of the former to Spain, could have no other result than to perpetuate their connection with the Catholic Church. In France, the civil wars and the political settlement to which they led resulted in the formation of the Huguenots into a compact body, formidable for defense, but powerless for the propagation of their faith.

3. The counter-reformation in the Catholic Church, by removing the gross abuses which had been the object of righteous complaint, took a formidable weapon from the hands of the Protestants. At the same time, the apathy of the old Church was broken up, the attention of its rulers was no longer absorbed in ambitious schemes of politics, or in the gratification of a literary taste, which made the papal court a rendezvous of authors and artists; but a profound zeal for the doctrines and forms of the Roman Catholic religion pervaded and united all ranks of its disciples.

4. While this concentration of forces was taking place on the Catholic side, Protestants more and more spent their strength in contests with one another. Their mutual intolerance facilitated the advance of their common enemy. Moreover, the warm, religious feeling that animated the early Reformers and the princes who defended their cause passed away to a considerable degree, and was succeeded by a theological rigidness, or a selfish, political spirit. The appearance of such a character as Maurice of Saxony, in so marked contrast with the Electors who listened to the voice of Luther, and even with the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, indicates the advent of an era when a more politic and selfish temper displaces the simplicity of religious principle. Queen Elizabeth, with her lukewarm attachment to the Reformation, and her mendacious, crooked policy, is a poor representative of the religious character of

[1] "Wie wir öfter bemerkt, der Protestantismus ist nicht bekehrender Natur. Es wird sich jedes Beitritts, der aus Ueberzeugung entspringt, als eines Fortganges seiner guten Sache freuen: sonst aber schon zufrieden sein, wenn nur selber verstattet ist, sich ungeirrt von fremder Einwirkung zu entwickeln. Dies war es, wonach die evangelischen Fürsten vom ersten Augenblick an strebten." — Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, v. 278.

Protestantism. How much more intense and consistent was the religious zeal of the secular leader of the Catholic restoration, Philip II.! The ardor of Protestants spent itself in domestic discord, at the very time when the ardor of Catholicism was exerted, with undivided energy, against them.

5. The better organization of the Catholic Church was a signal advantage in the battle with Protestantism, which was divided into as many churches as there were political communities that embraced the new doctrine. On the Catholic side there was a better chance for a plan of operations, having respect not to a single country alone, a separate portion of the field of combat, but formed upon a survey of the whole situation, and carried out with sole reference to a united success.

6. Another source of power in the Catholic Church grew out of the habit of availing itself of all varieties of religious temperament, of turning to the best account the wide diversity of talents and character which is developed within its fold. The dispassionate and astute politician, the laborious scholar, the subtle and skillful polemic, the fiery enthusiast, are none of them rejected, but all of them assigned to a work suited to their respective capacities. Men as dissimilar as Bellarmine and Ignatius were engaged in a common cause, and were even within the same fraternity. This custom of the Catholic Church is often attributed to a profound policy. But whatever sagacity it may indicate, it is probably due less to the calculations of a far-sighted policy, than to an habitual principle, or way of thinking in religion, which is inherent in the genius of Catholicism. It has been justly observed that men of the type of John Wesley, who, among Protestants, have been forced to become the founders of distinct religious bodies, would have found within the Catholic Church, had they been born there, hospitable treatment and congenial employment. The host that was marshaled under the command of the Pope, for the defense of Catholicism, was like an army that includes light-armed skirmishers and heavy-armed artillerymen, swift cavalry, and spies who can penetrate the camp and pry into the counsels of the enemy.

7. It cannot be denied that in southern Europe there was manifested a more rooted attachment to the Roman Catholic system than existed among the nations which adopted the

Reformation. In Germany the common people gladly heard the teaching of Luther. Protestantism there had much of the character of a national movement. In Italy and Spain it was mainly the lettered class that received the new doctrine. Below a certain grade of culture few were affected by it. Even in France, which had something like a middle position between the two currents of opinion, it was the intelligent middle class, together with scholars and nobles, that furnished to Protestantism its adherents. In Italy and Spain the new doctrine did not reach down to the springs of national life. Moreover, it is remarkable that in these nations which remained Catholic, so many who went so far as to receive the evangelical doctrine substantially as it was held by the Protestants were not impelled to cast off the polity or worship of the old Church. This circumstance is far from being wholly due to timidity. The outward forms of Protestantism were less necessary, less congenial to them; the outward forms of Catholicism were less obnoxious. Even in France, this same phenomenon appeared in the circle that early gathered about Lefèvre and Briçonnet, and especially in Margaret of Navarre and her followers. The doctrine of gratuitous salvation through the merits of Christ, the inwardness of piety, as fostered by the evangelical doctrine, were grateful to them; but they were not moved to renounce the government or the Sacraments of the Church, or to affiliate themselves with the Protestant body.

When all these circumstances are contemplated, it will cease to be a matter of wonder that Protestantism, after its first great victories were won, halted in its course and was at length shut up within fixed boundaries.

But the Catholic party were destined to suffer from internal discord. Before the close of the century, the followers of Ignatius, who were semi-Pelagian in their theology, became involved in a hot strife with the Dominicans, who in common with their master, Aquinas, were nearer to Augustine in their view of the relation of grace to free will. The theological conflict that was thus kindled was of long continuance, and brought serious disasters upon the Catholic Church, and, in its ultimate effect, upon the Jesuit order. This was one of a number of adverse influences which conspired finally to paralyze the Catholic reaction, and to stop the progress of the counter-reformation.

CHAPTER XII

THE STRUGGLE OF PROTESTANTISM IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The Catholic Reaction, of which the Pope was the spiritual, and Philip II., the secular chief, experienced a terrible reverse in the ruin of the Spanish Armada, and the failure of that gigantic project for the conquest of England. The establishment of Henry IV. on the throne of France was a still more discouraging blow. France, the Netherlands, and Great Britain were the principal theater of the efforts which had for their end the political predominance of the Spanish monarchy and the spiritual supremacy of Rome. The struggle of Protestantism continues through the greater part of the seventeenth century. Gradually the Catholic Reaction expended its force, and political motives and ideas subordinated the impulses of fanaticism.

The principal topics to be considered are the thirty years' war; the English revolutions; the domestic and foreign policy of Richelieu and of Louis XIV. The reign of Louis XIV. falls principally in the latter half of the seventeenth century, or the period following the great European settlement, the Peace of Westphalia. Yet some notice of this reign is requisite for a full view of the conflict of Protestantism and Catholicism.[1]

Charles V. had found himself deceived in his political calculations, and baffled by the moral force of the Protestant faith in Germany. His final defeat in the attempt to subjugate the Protestants left the Empire weak. It is not true that Germany lost its political unity through the Reformation, for this unity was practically gone before; rather is it true that then it sacrificed the opportunity of recovering its unity and of placing it on an enduring foundation. The Reformation in Germany, more

[1] Häusser, *Geschichte des Zeitalters d. Reformation* (1868). Von Raumer, *Geschichte Europas seit d. Ende d.* 15. *Jahr.*, vol. iii. Laurent, *Les Nationalités*, l. i. ch. iv. Ranke, *Geschichte Wallensteins* (3d ed., 1872). Carlyle, *History of Frederic II.*, vol. i., b. iii., chaps. xiv., xvi.

than in any other country, emanated not from statesmen and rulers, but from the hearts of the people. It was hindered from being universal by the obstacles cast in its way and by its own internal divisions.

The Peace of Augsburg, unsatisfactory as its provisions were to both parties, effected its end as long as the emperors were impartial in their administration. This was true of Ferdinand I., whose accession was resisted by Paul IV., the enemy of his House; and it was true especially of Maximilian II., who was himself strongly inclined to Protestant opinions, and was openly charged with heresy by Catholic zealots. Under his tolerant sway, Protestantism spread over Austria, with the exception of the rural and secluded valleys of the Tyrol. Charles V. had been obliged to relinquish his wish to hand down the imperial crown to his son Philip. Philip, in his fanatical exertions against Protestantism, did not receive countenance or support from the Austrian branch of his family. The cruelties of Alva in the Netherlands, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew, were condemned and deplored by the Emperor. Philip was so afraid that Maximilian himself would join the Protestants that he deemed it necessary to dissuade him, by the most pressing exhortations, from taking such a step. While the contest was raging in the Netherlands, and between the Huguenots and their enemies in France the Lutherans of Germany remained for the most part neutral. Their hostility to Calvinism had much to do in determining their position. They were warned by William of Orange and other Protestants abroad that the cause was one, and that if Catholic fanaticism were not checked, Germany would be the next victim. In the latter portion of Maximilian's reign, which was from 1564 to 1576, the Jesuits came in, and disturbances arose. Rudolph II., his successor, had been brought up in Spain, and was under the influence of this Order. The same spirit characterized Matthias, who followed next. In consequence of the incompetence of Rudolph, the government of Austria and Hungary had, during his life, been taken from him and given to Matthias, and he in turn gave way, in like manner, to his cousin Archduke Ferdinand of Styria, a bigoted Catholic (1619–37). Ferdinand and Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria, were the devoted champions of the Catholic Reaction. Matthias had been compelled to grant a letter patent to the

Bohemians, which gave them full religious toleration and equal rights with the Catholics. Violations of the Religious Peace in Germany on the side of the Catholics were frequent. Bishops and Catholic cities drove out their Protestant subjects and abolished Protestant worship. The indignation of the Protestants throughout Germany was excited by the treatment of the free city of Donauwörth, which was exclusively Protestant, and refused to allow processions from a Catholic convent, these being inconsistent with a former agreement. The city was placed under the ban of the Empire, and the Bavarian Duke marched against it with an overwhelming force, excluded Protestant worship, and incorporated the town with his own territories (1607). Complaints were made on the Catholic side of infractions of the Ecclesiastical Proviso, which ordained that benefices should be vacated by incumbents who should embrace Protestantism. The Protestants had permitted the Emperor, in the Peace of Augsburg, on his own authority, to affirm the Proviso, which they themselves at the same time firmly refused to adopt; just as the imperial declaration for the protection of Protestant communities within the jurisdiction of Catholic prelates had been permitted by the other party. Protestant princes had given to benefices lying near them, which had already been gained to the Reformation, bishops or administrators from their own kinsmen; and at the diets they urged the complete abolishment of all such restrictions upon religious freedom.[1] But the Proviso was rigidly enforced in the case of the Elector of Cologne, who went over to Protestantism in 1582. The outrage perpetrated against Donauwörth led to the formation of the Evangelical Union (1608), a league into which, however, all the Protestant States did not enter, and which from the beginning was weakly organized. But the Catholic League, which was formed to oppose it, under the leadership of Maximilian of Bavaria, was firmly cemented and full of energy. On the Protestant side, in addition to other sources of discord, the hostility of the strict Lutherans to the Calvinists was a continual and fruitful cause of division. The Bohemians revolted against Ferdinand II. in 1618, when their religious liberties were vio-

[1] Gieseler, IV. i. 1, § 11. Upon the history and interpretation of the Ecclesiastical Reservation, see Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, v. 265, 274 seq. (*Werke*, vii. 7 seq.), Gieseler, IV. i. 1, § 9 and n. 40.

lated, and "according to the good old Bohemian custom," as one of the nobles expressed it, flung two of the imperial councilors out of the window. When, shortly after, on the death of Matthias, Ferdinand became his successor, the Bohemians refused to acknowledge him as their king, and gave the crown of Bohemia to Ferderic V., the Elector Palatine, and the son-in-law of James I. of England. Ferdinand, a nursling of the Jesuits, who had early taken a vow to extirpate heresy in his dominions, which he had kept, up to the measure of his ability, threw himself as much from necessity as from choice, into the arms of the Catholic League. He manifested his ardor in the Catholic cause by an assiduous attention to religious services. For example, he took part in a procession in the midst of a storm of rain emulating thus the zeal which the Emperor Julian displayed in celebrating the rites of heathenism. Thus the Austrian imperial house took up the work which had been laid down by Charles V., of defending and propagating Catholicism, in alliance with the Church. The Catholic Reaction, which had found a representative in Philip II., found another leader in the Emperor: and the two branches of the Hapsburg family were more united in religious sympathies. The Elector, Frederic, with his obtrusive Calvinism, and with a court whose customs and manners were not congenial with Bohemian feeling — receiving little support, moreover, from the Protestant princes or from England — suffered a complete defeat. Lutheran prejudices and the fear of countenancing rebellion and the revolutionary spirit deprived him of his natural allies. The result was that Bohemia was abandoned to fire and sword. In the frightful persecution which had for its object the eradication of Protestantism, and in the protracted wars that ensued upon it, the population was reduced from about four millions to between seven and eight hundred thousand! It was only when the Palatinate was conquered and devastated;[1] when the electoral rank was transferred to the Duke of Bavaria, and with it the territories of Frederic, except what was given to Spain; and when the enterprise of banishing Protestantism was actively undertaken by the combined agency of the troops of the League and of Jesuit priests, that the Protestant powers took up the cause of the fugitive Elector. In 1625 England, Holland, and Denmark entered into an alliance

[1] The Heidelberg Library was carried off to Rome.

for his restoration. Christian IV. of Denmark was defeated, and the Danish intervention failed. By robbing Frederic of the electoral dignity and conferring it on the Bavarian Duke, a majority in the electoral body was acquired by the Catholics. But the power and station which the Duke gained, separated, in important particulars, his interests from those of Ferdinand. It was through the aid of Wallenstein and his consummate ability in collecting and organizing, as well as leading an army, that Ferdinand was able to emancipate himself from the virtual control of Maximilian and the League.[1] Wallenstein was a Bohemian noble, proud, able, and swayed by dreams of ambition; unscrupulous in respect to the means which might be required for the fulfillment of his daring schemes. He had rendered valuable military services to Ferdinand; and, on the suppression of the Bohemian revolt, had acquired vast wealth by the purchase of confiscated property. He offered to raise an army and to sustain it. He made it support itself by pillage. It was a period of transition in the method of prosecuting war, when the old system of feudal militia had passed away, and the modern system of national forces or standing armies had not arisen. Armies were made up of hirelings of all nations, who prosecuted war as a trade wherever the richest booty was to be gained; considering indiscriminate robbery a legitimate incident of warfare. The ineffable miseries of the protracted struggle in Germany were due, to a considerable extent, to this composition of the armies. Bands of organized plunderers, with arms in their hands, were let loose upon an unprotected population, captured cities being given up to the unbridled passions of a fierce and lawless soldiery. The unarmed people dreaded their friends hardly less than their foes. The good behavior of the Swedes was a marvel to the inhabitants with whom they came in contact; and even the Swedes, after the death of their great leader, sunk down towards the level of the rest of the combatants in this frightful conflict. It is no wonder that Germany, traversed and trampled for a whole generation by these hosts of marauders, was reduced almost to a desert; that it endured calamities from which it has never entirely recovered.

Victory attended the arms of Wallenstein and of Tilly, the

[1] Ranke, *Geschichte Wallensteins* (3d ed., 1872). This biography, as might be expected, is highly instructive on the whole subject of the thirty years' war.

General of the League. Brunswick and Hanover, Silesia, Schleswig and Holstein, fell into their power. The dukes of Mecklenburg were put under the ban of the Empire, and their territory given, as a reward, to Wallenstein (1627). He was anxious to reduce the German towns on the Baltic. But Stralsund offered a stubborn resistance which he could not overcome, although he vowed that he would have the town if it were bound to the sky by chains of adamant. His ambitious schemes were quite independent of the schemes of the League, which could not count upon his support. Such was their jealousy and animosity towards the commander who had made Ferdinand free from their dictation that they induced him to remove Wallenstein from his command. Shortly before this, however, they had moved the Emperor to the adoption of a measure equally dangerous to his cause, and one that put far distant the hopes of peace. This was the famous Edict of Restitution (1629), which declared that the Protestant States, after the Treaty of Passau, had no right to appropriate the ecclesiastical benefices which were under their lordship, and that every act of secularization of this nature was null; that all archbishoprics and bishoprics which had become Protestant since that treaty must be surrendered; that the Declaration of Ferdinand I., giving liberty to the Protestant subjects of ecclesiastical princes, was invalid, and that such subjects might be forced to become Catholics, or expelled from their homes. That is, the parts of the Religious Peace that were odious to the Protestants were to be enforced, according to the strictest construction, while the parts obnoxious to the Catholics were to be abrogated. Moreover, the Edict ordained that the Religious Peace should not avail for the protection of Calvinists, Zwinglians, or any other dissenters save the adherents of the Augsburg Confession. The changes that had taken place since the Passau Treaty were of such a character that the execution of the Edict would have brought a sweeping and violent revolution in the Protestant communities. It was evident that nothing less was aimed at than the entire extinction of Protestantism. The most lukewarm of the Princes, including the Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony, were roused by this measure to a sense of the common danger. Thus the Edict of Restitution and the removal of Wallenstein from his command, the two measures dictated by the League, aided the Protestant

cause; the first by awakening and combining its supporters, and the second by weakening the military strength of their adversaries. Wallenstein was a sacrifice to the League and to the ambition of Maximilian.

In the second act of this long drama, Gustavus Adolphus, of Sweden, is the hero. It had been his aim in a conflict of eighteen years, with Denmark, Poland, and Russia, to control the Baltic Sea. Not only was this political aim imperiled by the imperial conquests, but they involved the danger of a Catholic reaction in Sweden itself. Besides this motive, the Swedish King was impelled to intervene by a genuine attachment to Protestantism, such as had inspired German princes, like Frederic of Saxony, and Philip of Hesse, in the first age of the Reformation. He was not a crusader, who sought to exterminate the opposing faith. Rather did he wish both religious parties to respect each other's rights and dwell in amity. His interposition, full of peril to himself, was regarded by Brandenburg and Saxony with jealousy and repugnance. It was not until the barbarous sack and burning of Magdeburg by the savage troops of Tilly (1631), that the neutral party was forced to side with Sweden. The victory of Gustavus over Tilly, and the triumphant advance of the Swedes into the South of Germany, prostrated the power of the League. We find that Gustavus was regarded with suspicion by the princes but with cordiality by the German cities. Whether his plan of peace, which embraced the repeal of the Edict of Restitution, the toleration everywhere of both religions, the restoration of the Elector Palatine to his territories and to the electoral dignity, and the banishment of the Jesuits, contemplated his own elevation to the rank of King of Rome, must remain uncertain. No alternative was left to Ferdinand but to call back Wallenstein from his estates, and give him absolute powers in the conduct of the war, — powers which made him independent of all control, and exempt from liability to another removal. The battle of Lutzen, in 1632, was a great defeat of Wallenstein, and a glorious victory for the Swedes; but it cost them the life of their King.

In the new phase which the war assumed after the fall of Gustavus, the influence of Richelieu becomes more and more predominant. The policy of the Cardinal was to attain the end, which French politics had so long pursued, of breaking down

the power of Hapsburg, and, at the same time, of profiting by the intestine conflict in Germany, by extending the French frontier on the east.

The ground on which Richelieu vindicated himself for lending aid to Protestants was that the war was not a religious but a political one. It was the old contest of France against the ambitious effort of the house of Hapsburg, to destroy the independence of other nations, and build up a universal monarchy. This imputation was indignantly denied; nor is there reason to think that such a design was seriously entertained by the Emperor and his partisans. Yet a complete success in their mixed political and religious enterprise would have given them a dangerous preponderance. In the warfare of Philip II. against Protestantism, the supremacy of Spain and the triumph of the Catholic cause were linked together in his mind. Richelieu, in turn, was charged with cherishing an equal ambition in behalf of France. The accusation had so much of truth that he, doubtless, aimed to raise his country to the leading place among the European nations. Holland helped the anti-Austrian league by carrying on its own contest against the troops of Spain, but was deterred from entering further into the war by apprehensions in reference to France, and the consequences that would follow the augmentation of French power. Richelieu had refrained from engaging in the German war, until the quelling of the Huguenots and the capture of Rochelle left his hands free. In return for the subsidies which he furnished Gustavus, he had been able to gain from the wary monarch no share in the control of the war, but only the pledge that no attack should be made upon the Catholic religion as such. Oxenstiern, the Swedish Chancellor, on whom the principal conduct of affairs now devolved, was careful to retain for the Swedes the supreme direction of the war, which was done in the Heilbronn Treaty of 1633, when France entered into an alliance with Sweden and the Protestant States. Wallenstein became more and more an object of dread to his imperial master, as well as to the League. The commander, whom it was now impossible either to remove or to control, was plotting to arrange for a peace, in which he should settle with France and Sweden, satisfy the Protestants, and probably reserve Bohemia, as a reward for himself. He had sounded his officers, and confided in their fidelity to their leader. The

murder of Wallenstein (1634) was the means chosen to punish his treason, and avert the threatened danger.

The imperial victory in the battle of Nordlingen, in 1634, had the effect to give to Richelieu the predominance which he had long aspired after. The Swedish force was broken. The aid of France had now become a necessity. France and Sweden were thenceforward to have an equal part in the management of the war. Brandenburg and Saxony, to whom the connection with Sweden had always been repugnant, made for themselves a separate treaty with the Emperor, by which the Edict of Restitution, as far as they were concerned, was abrogated. The treaty between Saxony and the Emperor was concluded at Prague in 1635. That the Elector should enter into this disgraceful arrangement was owing, in part, to his jealousy of Sweden, and, in part, to the bigoted hostility to Calvinism, that prevailed in his court. Richelieu's desire to build up a French party among the Germans seemed to be accomplished, when Bernard, of Weimar, their foremost general, was taken into the pay of France. Yet Bernard could not be relied on to consent to a permanent cession of territory to that country: in his testament, he expressly declared against it. The death of Bernard in 1639 placed the Cardinal at the goal of all his efforts; for the prosecution of the war was left in the hands of the French, and the armies came under the lead of French officers. The character of the war had entirely changed. Protestant states were fighting on the imperial side, and paying a heavy price for their desertion of their former allies. Eight more years of war were required to bring the Court of Vienna to consent to a full amnesty and to the restoration of the religious peace, involving the surrender of the Edict of Restitution; measures which were indispensable to the termination of the weary conflict. An acquiescence in these necessary terms of peace was at last wrung from the Emperor by his military reverses.

The cruelties inflicted during this war, especially during the last years of it, upon the defenseless people, are indescribable. The population of Germany is said to have diminished in thirty years from twenty to fifty per cent. The population of Augsburg was reduced from eighty thousand to eighteen thousand. Of the four hundred thousand inhabitants of Würtemberg as late as 1641, only forty-eight thousand were left. Cities, vil-

lages, castles, and houses innumerable had been burned to the ground. The bare statistics of the destruction of life and property are appalling.

The Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, confirmed the Ecclesiastical Reservation — fixing, however, 1624 as the normal year, to decide which faith should possess ecclesiastical properties. It modified the *jus reformandi*, according to which the religion of each state was to be determined by that of the prince; and in this matter, also, 1624 was made the normal year. That is to say, whatever might be the faith of the prince, the religion of each state was to be Catholic or Protestant, according to its position at that date. As to their share in the imperial administration, the two religions were placed on a footing of substantial equality. Religious freedom and civil equality were also extended to the Calvinists; only these three forms of religion were to be tolerated in the Empire. But the Empire was reduced to a shadow by the giving of the power to decide, instead of advising, in all matters of peace, war, taxation, and the like, to the Diet, and by the allowance granted to members of the Diet to contract alliances with one another and with foreign powers, provided no prejudice should come thereby to the Empire or the Emperor. The independence of Holland and of Switzerland was formally acknowledged. Sweden obtained the territory about the Baltic, which Gustavus had wanted, in addition to other important places about the North Sea, and the mouths of the Oder, the Weser, and the Elbe; in consequence of which cession Sweden became a member of the German Diet. Among the acquisitions of France were the three bishoprics, Metz, Toul, and Verdun, and the landgraviate of Upper and Lower Alsace; France thus gaining access to the Rhine. Both Sweden and France, by becoming guarantees of the peace, obtained the right to interfere in the internal affairs of Germany. So great was the penalty paid for civil discord.

England, during the reign of the Stuart kings, descended from the lofty position which it had held among the European states, as a bulwark of Protestantism. James I. (1603–1625) brought to the throne the highest notions of kingly authority, and in connection with them, a cordial hatred of Presbyterianism, which his experiences in Scotland led him to regard as a

natural ally of popular government. He expressed his conviction in the maxim, "No bishop, no king." The contrast between obsequious prelates on their knees before him, and the ministers of the Kirk who pulled his sleeve as they administered their blunt rebukes, delighted his soul. He found himself not only delivered from his tormentors, but an object of adulation. He had once said of the "neighbor Kirk in England" that "it is an evil-said mass in English;"[1] but he was cured of this aversion if it was ever seriously entertained. During the reign of James, the gulf between the Anglican Church and the Puritans was widened, chiefly in consequence of two changes which took place in the former. The episcopal polity which had been regarded, in the age of Elizabeth, as one among various admissible forms of Church government, came to be more and more considered a divine ordinance, and indispensable to the constitution of a Church; so that, as Macaulay expresses it, a Church might as well be without the doctrine of the Trinity or the Incarnation, as without bishops. The other change was the spread in the Anglican body, of the Arminian theology, which introduced a doctrinal difference that had not existed before between the established Church and the Puritans.[2] As the common enemy, which Anglican and Puritan combined to oppose, became less formidable, since the great majority of the nation were now hostile to the Catholic Church, the two Protestant parties were less restrained from mutual contention, and were led by the very influence of their conflict with one another to sharpen their characteristic points of difference.

James lost no time in evincing his hostility to the Puritans. On his way to London, the Millenary petition, signed by nearly a thousand ministers, who asked for the abolishment of usages most obnoxious to the Puritans, was not only received with no favor, but ten of those who had presented the petition were

[1] Calderwood, v. 105, 106; Burton, vi. 221.

[2] James sent delegates to the Synod of Dort, who made to him full reports of its proceedings. Some of them he rewarded with promotion in the Church. Mrs. Hutchinson, writing of the interval between 1639 and 1641, in the next reign, says of the doctrine of predestination: "At that time this great doctrine grew much out of fashion with the prelates, but was generally embraced by all religious and holy persons in the land." *Life of Col. Hutchinson*, p. 66 (Bohn's ed.). The admirable picture of Puritan character presented in this memoir is marred only by the writer's strong prejudice against Cromwell. The literature on the history of Arminianism in the English Church is given by Cunningham. *The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation*, p. 168 seq.

actually imprisoned by the Star Chamber, on the ground that their act tended to sedition and treason. The petitioners were not Separatists; they made no objection to episcopacy. They complained of non-residence, pluralities, and like abuses, and of the cross in baptism, the cap and surplice, and a few other ceremonial peculiarities.[1] The opportunity was presented for a scheme of Comprehension, which, had it been adopted, would have had the most important consequences; but that opportunity was not embraced. In the Hampton Court Conference, where a few Puritan divines met the bishops, the King treated the former with unfairness and insolence. He plumed himself on the theological learning and acumen which he fancied himself to possess, and which formed one of his titles to the distinction, which his flatterers gave him, of being the Solomon of his age. The praises lavished on him by the bishops — one of whom declared that he undoubtedly spoke by the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost — in connection with their extravagant theory of royal authority, and of the submission owed by the subject, filled him with delight. This Conference had one valuable result. Dr. Reynolds, one of the Puritan representatives, and perhaps the most learned man in the kingdom, recommended that a new or revised version of the Scriptures should be prepared; and this suggestion James, who complained of certain marginal observations in "the Geneva Bible," which were unfavorable to the sacredness of royalty, caught up and caused to be carried out.[2] The desire of the clergy to enhance their own authority by exalting that of the crown appears in the ambitious schemes of Bancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, which encountered the resistance of Coke, the great champion of the common law. As long as Cecil was in power, the foreign politics of James were not destitute of spirit; but the timidity of the King, joined with his desire to marry his son to a Spanish princess, prevented him from efficiently supporting his son-in-law, the Elector Palatine, at the outbreaking of the thirty years'

[1] Hallam, ch. vi. (p. 173).

[2] The Hampton Court Conference is interesting and important, as presenting the characteristics of the two ecclesiastical parties and of the sovereign. Most of the accounts of it are derived from Dr. Barlow's report, who was on the anti-Puritan side. See Fuller, *Church History*, v. 266; Neal, p. ii., ch. i.; Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 121; Burton, *History of Scotland*, vi. 218 seq. Hallam (*Const. Hist.*, ch. vi.) has candid and just remarks on the behavior of the king and of the bishops.

war, and moved him basely to sacrifice Raleigh to the vengeance of Spain. His want of common sense was manifested in his attempt to impose episcopacy upon the Scottish Church. His arbitrary principles of government, which he had not prudence enough to prevent him from constantly proclaiming, prepared the way for the great civil contest that broke out in the next reign.

Charles I. (1625–1649) made the deliberate attempt to govern England without a Parliament. There is no doubt that it was his design to convert the limited monarchy into an absolute one. Although a sincere Protestant, he sympathized fully with what may be termed the Romanizing party in the English Church or the party which stood at the farthest remove from Puritanism, and nearest to the religious system of the Church of Rome. Charles's treatment of the Papists was vacillating. Now the laws would be executed against them, and now the execution of them would be illegally suspended by the King's decree. But the occasional severities of the government towards them could not efface the impression which had been made by the sending of an English fleet to aid in the blockade of Rochelle (1625), which the French King was seeking to wrest from the Huguenots. Laud, an honest but narrow-minded and superstitious man, became Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1633. To advance, in respect to doctrine and ceremonies, as near as possible to the Roman Catholic system, without accepting the jurisdiction of the Pope, was his manifest inclination. He records his dreams in his diary. On one occasion he dreamed that he was reconverted to the Church of Rome.[1] It was an unpleasant dream since it related to a danger that, as he doubtless felt, attended his measures, but which he meant to escape. His impracticable character and lack of tact even James I. accurately discerned. "The plain truth is that I keep Laud back from all place of rule and authority, because I find that he hath a restless spirit, and cannot see when matters are well, but loves to toss and change, and to bring things to a pitch of reformation, floating in his own brain, which may endanger the steadfastness of that which is in a good pass." Of Laud's plans respecting the Scots, James added: "He knows not the stomach of that people."[2] By

[1] Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, vi. 390.

[2] The authority for this statement of James is Bishop John Hacket. Burton, vi. 338.

means of the Court of High Commission, a species of Protestant Inquisition, he engaged with a vigilant and merciless zeal in the persecution of Puritans. They were even prosecuted for not complying with new ceremonies which Laud himself had introduced, and for preaching Calvinism; and they were punished for declining to read in the churches, the "Book of Sports," which recommended games and pastimes, of which they did not approve. The Star Chamber, and the High Commission, are emblems, as they were effective instruments, of the ecclesiastical and civil tyranny to which the English people were subjected. The endeavor to force the English Prayer-book upon Scotland called out, in 1638, the Solemn League and Covenant of the Scots for the defense of Presbyterianism. In 1642 hostilities began between the Long Parliament and the King, the immediate occasion being the abortive attempt of Charles, in violation of his pledges, to arrest Pym and his associates, in the House of Commons. The same year Parliament convoked the Westminster Assembly to advise them in the matter of reconstructing the Church of England. At the outset, a majority of its members were not only conforming ministers, but would have been content with a moderate episcopacy. It has been said with truth that moderate Episcopalians of the school of Usher, and moderate Presbyterians of the stamp of Baxter, had little difficulty in finding a common ground on which they could unite. A second party which, if not numerous in the Assembly, was growing in the nation, was that of the Independents who held to the self-governing power of the local congregation or church, into the communion of which they would receive none who did not give proof of being spiritual or regenerated persons. Rejecting the government of prelates and of synods, they favored voluntary associations for counsel and for the prosecution, in concert, of Christian work. The Independents were denied the liberty which they strove to obtain at the hands of the Presbyterians; and the rejection by them of a scheme of comprehension, which would have united both sections of the Puritan party, has been deplored, even by Neal and Baxter, advocates of the Presbyterian system. The Erastians, among whom in the Assembly were Lightfoot and Selden, of all the members the most eminent for their learning, were in favor of giving the regulation of all ecclesiastical affairs to the state. The influence of the

Scots, and the necessity of a union with them, in order successfully to withstand Charles, were powerful considerations with the whole Puritan body. Parliament adopted the Scottish Covenant, and the Assembly the Presbyterian polity. But Parliament steadily refused to concede to this system a divine right, or to yield up its own supremacy, as a court of ultimate appeal. The Calvinistic theory of the Church, as a distinct power, having the complete right to excommunicate its members, or to interdict communion, was not allowed. It was a point which the Scottish influence was not strong enough to carry. The Confession and Catechism, prepared by the Assembly, were made the Creed of the Church of England, and their "Directory" was put forth by authority of Parliament, for the regulation of worship, in the room of the Prayer-book. Between one and two thousand ministers who refused the new subscriptions, were deprived of their places.[1] The Presbyterian system, similar to that in Scotland, with the exception that appeals might be taken from the highest ecclesiastical tribunals to Parliament, was now legally established in England. But shortly after the new regulations were passed, the Independents, of whom Cromwell was the chief, attained to supreme power in the state. The consequence was, that Presbyterianism was never fully established in more than two counties, Middlesex and Lancashire. Cromwell set up a Board of "Triers" for the examination and approval of candidates for benefices, and without the certificate of this Board, composed mostly of Independent divines, no person could take an ecclesiastical office. Their certificate was a substitute for institution and induction. But the Puritans, when they found themselves in possession of power, interdicted the use of the Prayer-book in private houses as well as in churches, and imitated, but too successfully, the persecuting spirit of their opponents. Cromwell himself, in comparison with the Puritan leaders generally, was of a liberal and tolerant spirit. The Independents were, generally speaking, favorable to religious toleration. Yet, it was only a few, at first, who fully adopted the principle that the magistrate should use no coercion whatever in matters of religious belief, or the principle that the State should leave entirely to the congregations the

[1] As to the number and character of the ejected ministers, see Vaughan, *English Nonconformity*, p. 127.

pecuniary support of the ministry. The doctrine of religious liberty found, at that day, some warm advocates, such as Vane, and John Milton, the ornament of the Independent party.

The settlement of New England was a result of the religious conflicts among the Protestants of England. In the reign of James I. a congregation of Independents escaped from persecution in England, under circumstances of great difficulty and hardship, and found an asylum in Holland. A portion of this church of emigrants, at Leyden, having received the benediction of their pastor, John Robinson, crossed the Atlantic in the Mayflower, and in December, 1620, began the settlement of Plymouth. Afterwards, in the reign of Charles I., bands of Nonconformists from England, organized the colony of Massachusetts. The Plymouth settlers were Separatists; the Massachusetts settlers were not. But as Robinson had predicted, "unconformable Christians" of both classes found no difficulty in agreeing in Church principles, as soon as they found themselves out of the kingdom of England, and at full liberty to regulate their ecclesiastical affairs for themselves. They adopted in common the Congregational system of Church government. The settlers of Massachusetts organized a State as well as a Church. They founded a religious commonwealth; a community in which all political power was placed in the hands of members of the Church; a theocratic State. They have been censured for the practice of intolerance towards opponents of their creed, and of their ecclesiastical and political order. On this point, a distinction is to be made between the settlers of Massachusetts and those of Plymouth. Among the latter, religious liberty was cherished. It is important to remember that the Massachusetts colony was not a full-blown commonwealth, but a society organized under a charter; at most, an incipient State. What may be safe and tolerable in a mature, fully established political community, may be unsafe and destructive in an infant society of this character; especially in an age of religious ferment and violent agitation. Yet it must not be supposed that the founders of Massachusetts and of the other New England colonies, except Rhode Island, which were soon after formed, were advocates of "liberty of conscience." They generally believed that it belongs to the civil magistrate to protect orthodoxy. They had not advanced to the more liberal doctrine as to the rights of the

individual, to the more restricted notion of the province of the State, which Independents of the school of Milton and Vane expressed, and which formed one of the peculiarities of Roger Williams.[1]

Under the Protector, England once more took the high and commanding place in Europe, which she had lost since the death of Elizabeth. Heavy blows were struck at the Spanish monarchy. Protestants, wherever they were oppressed, found in the English Ruler a defender whose arm was long enough to smite their assailants.

The English people, after the death of Cromwell (1658), were more and more impatient of the rule of the army, and yearned for their old institutions of government. Hence they gave a cordial welcome to Charles II. (1660). The fatal mistake was made of requiring from him no formal guaranties of civil and religious liberty. The restoration was effected by a combined effort of the Presbyterians and the Episcopalians.[2] The Presbyterians had stood aloof from the extreme measures of the reigning party under the Commonwealth: the Presbyterian members had been expelled from Parliament before the trial of the King. This party had warm hopes, not only from the agency which they had exerted in bringing back the King, but also from his promises. In the Declaration from Breda, prior to his return, Charles had declared that no man should "be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom." He had promised "a liberty to tender consciences" and "an indulgence" to be secured by Act of Parliament. The Worcester House Declaration of the King, shortly after the Restoration, more than confirmed these pledges; but they were all to be falsified. The Presbyterians found themselves deceived. Charles was himself a good-natured sensualist, secretly fond of

[1] Among the multitude of books on the principles of the founders of New England, we may refer to Palfrey's learned and able *History of New England*, vol. i.; to Dr. H. M. Dexter, *The Congregationalism of the last* 300 *years* (1880); to Dr. G. E. Ellis's *The Puritan Age and Rule in . . . Massachusetts* (1888); and to Dr. G. L. Walker's *Some Aspects of the Religious Life of New England* (1897); to *Historical Discourses*, by Leonard Bacon (1839).

[2] Forster, *Life of Cromwell*, in the *Statesmen of the Commonwealth*, vols. iii. and iv.; T. Carlyle, *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (3d ed., 1857). Besides the English historians, Hume, Clarendon, Godwin, Macaulay, and the others, we have, on this period, the works of Guizot, *History of the English Revolution*, and *Hist. of Cromwell, the Commonwealth, and the Restoration* (1854–1857).

the Romish Church, to which he conformed on his death-bed. But had he been disposed to be indulgent to Puritanism, the wave of the Anglican Reaction, which rose higher day by day; the Reaction in which a tender sentiment of loyalty to the family of the King was mingled with resentment against the party by whose instrumentality his father had been brought to the block, and with love to the Church, which had fallen with the throne, might have hindered him from carrying out his inclination. The anti-Puritan measures had the potent support of Clarendon. The Savoy Conference, in May, 1661, between twenty-one Anglican, and as many Presbyterian divines, after acrimonious debates, in which the Churchmen showed no disposition to come to an accommodation with their opponents, which would have retained in the Church a vast number of able and useful ministers, broke up without any result. Thus another great opportunity for Comprehension, for converting the Anglican establishment into a Broad Church, in which, with uniformity in essentials, there should be room for diversity in things of less moment, was thrown away. The Episcopal system was reinstated by Parliament. It was required that all ministers who had not been ordained by bishops should receive episcopal ordination; that all ministers should make a declaration of unfeigned assent and consent to the Prayer-book and to the whole system of the Church of England, should take the oath of canonical obedience, abjure the Solemn League and Covenant, and, moreover, solemnly abjure the doctrine of the lawfulness of taking up arms against the King or any commissioned by him, on any pretense whatsoever. Two thousand ministers — many of whom were among the best in the kingdom, men like Richard Baxter — who refused to comply with the terms of the Act of Uniformity, were in one day, in 1662, ejected from their livings.[1] This hard measure may, to be sure,

[1] *Documents relating to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity*, 1662. (London, 1862.) This is a valuable compilation. See, also, Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (1896), p. 585 seq. An excellent monograph on the Restoration in its ecclesiastical aspects, is the work of Stoughton, *Church and State Two Hundred Years Ago: From* 1660 *to* 1663 (1862). *The Life and Times of Richard Baxter* is a most instructive and entertaining contemporaneous authority. Baxter played a prominent part in the events of the period. If his scholarship was not accurate, his reading was vast. His mind was acute and fertile, and his piety was honored by his adversaries. But in public affairs, he was singularly destitute of tact, and he had a most exaggerated faith in the efficacy of disputations and of "a few necessary distinctions," where hostile parties were to be reconciled.

be looked upon as a retaliation for what was done to the Episcopal clergy under the Long Parliament. But those who rejected the Covenant received a fifth of the income of their places for the supply of their immediate necessities. In their case, also, there was a great political division, a civil war in which the ejected ministers were against the Parliament; while the ministers who were driven from their parishes in 1662 were loyal supporters of Charles, without whom he might never have obtained his throne.

Whoever would form a vivid idea of the demoralization of the English Court, should read the Diaries of Pepys and Evelyn, both of them Royalists, and the latter a man of elevated character, as well as of high culture. Men who had risked their lives for the fallen dynasty, but who retained some respect for morality and decency, were compelled to hide their heads with mortification at the shameless profligacy that was encouraged by the example of the King.

In 1670 Charles II. entered into the secret treaty with Louis XIV., which has been described as "a coalition against the Protestant faith and the liberties of Europe." It was agreed that Charles, at the fitting time, should avow himself a Catholic, and, with the help of Louis, establish a Catholic religion and absolute government in England. In return, Charles was to help Louis in his ambitious designs upon the Netherlands. The dominions of Spain in America were, if practicable, at a later day, to be divided between the two contracting powers. It is hardly probable that Louis expected to carry out the plot contained in this treaty, so far as the forcible establishment of the Catholic religion in England is concerned. It was enough for him, if the King and Parliament remained in a constant disagreement, and if England could be at least prevented from interfering with his schemes of conquest. The hesitation of Charles about professing his Catholicism retarded the movement for the accomplishment of the treaty. Strenuous opposition had sprung up in Parliament to the King, and especially to his brother, the Duke of York, who was an avowed Catholic. Fresh severities against Dissenters were undertaken, for the purpose of conciliating the Anglican clergy. The real designs and policy of Charles became evident after the commencement of the war against Holland. In 1673 a Declaration

of Indulgence, suspending the penal laws against Dissenters, was issued, for the purpose of winning their support or of deluding them into a false sense of security. Charles II. died in 1685.

James II., with the same subservience to foreign powers, and the same arbitrary notions of government which had belonged to his brother, was of a slower and more obstinate mind, and differed from Charles in cherishing a sincere and bigoted attachment to the Catholic religion. In 1686 the Court of High Commission, which had been abolished forever by the Long Parliament, was revived, and the notorious Jeffreys placed at its head. Finding that the Episcopalians were not to be won by the persecution of the Puritans, the Declaration for Liberty of Conscience was issued in 1687, for the sake of enlisting the Dissenters in behalf of his scheme of arbitrary government. However just the measure might be, it involved in itself a violent stretch of prerogative. But it was recognized as a part of a scheme, which, if accomplished, would bring upon Nonconformists and Churchmen alike a renewal of persecution in the most unrelenting form. The combination of parties, which was produced by the plot of James for subverting the Protestant religion and establishing Popery, gave rise to the Revolution of 1688, and the establishment of William of Orange upon the throne, who had married the eldest daughter of James, and had defended Holland and Protestantism against the assaults of Louis XIV. At the accession of William and Mary, says Hallam, "the Act of Toleration was passed with little difficulty, though not without murmurs of the bigoted Churchmen. It exempts from the penalties of existing statutes against separate conventicles, or absence from the established worship, such as should take the oath of allegiance and subscribe to the Declaration against Popery, and such ministers of separate congregations as should subscribe the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, except three, and a part of a fourth. It gives, also, an indulgence to Quakers, without this condition. Meeting houses are required to be registered and are protected from insult by a penalty. No part of this toleration is extended to Papists, or such as deny the Trinity." The subscription to the Articles of Faith was practically dispensed with; "though," adds Hallam, "such a genuine toleration as Christianity and

philosophy alike demand had no place in our statute book before the reign of George III."

The ministry of William III., when they introduced the Toleration Act, introduced also a Comprehension Bill, which released Nonconformists from the necessity of subscribing the Articles and Homilies, and delivered them from the obligation to fulfill certain ceremonies that were most obnoxious. Had this scheme been adopted, Presbyterians would have been admitted to the charge of parishes without reordination. It failed by the force of the opposition to it in Convocation, to which it was referred. Moderate Churchmen, like Tillotson, Burnet, Stillingfleet, Patrick, and Beveridge, were outnumbered by those who were resolutely averse to any modifications of the Prayer-book. The measure was lost, partly from the strength of this Anti-Puritan feeling, partly from the fact that Independents, Baptists, and Quakers were left out of the arrangement, which was shaped for the benefit of the Presbyterian ministers exclusively. The fear of strengthening the Church too much, which was apt to be an ally of arbitrary government, influenced in some degree the minds of certain statesmen. The great danger connected with this measure, a danger that was better appreciated afterwards, was that of giving a great augmentation of strength to the party of non-jurors, who had forfeited their benefices rather than acknowledge the new dynasty, and who, had the Liturgy been remodeled, might have grown into a powerful sect. It is stated, also, by Hallam and Macaulay, that the Presbyterian ministers, who at the head of large churches in London had a much higher and more comfortable station than fell to the lot of the degenerate and often ill-treated parish clergy, were lukewarm in favoring the adoption of the scheme, if not decidedly opposed to it. That they took this position is, however, questioned by other well-informed writers.[1]

The Revolution of 1688 led to the permanent establishment of the Presbyterian as the national Church of Scotland.[2] Under Charles II. Episcopacy was established by law in Scotland, although some latitude was granted, under the name of Indulgence, with regard to the forms of public worship. A fierce

[1] Vaughan, p. 461. The character of the scheme and the proceedings of Convocation are fully described by Macaulay, iii. 424 seq.

[2] See Hallam, *Const. Hist.*, ch. xvii. Macaulay, *Hist. of England* (Harpers' Am. ed.), i. 172; ii. 103 seq.; 115 seq.; 192; iii. 225, 622.

resistance was made by adherents of the Covenant during this reign and in the reign of James II., at whose instance it was made a capital offense to preach in a Presbyterian conventicle, or to attend such a meeting in the open air. James wanted to have the Roman Catholics delivered from the operation of penal laws, but to allow no favor to the Covenanters. The concessions which he was at last compelled to make to them were reduced to the narrowest compass. But they stood by their cause with stubborn bravery, through all those troubled

"times,
Whose echo rings through Scotland to this hour."

In 1690 the system which was obnoxious to the body of the Scottish people was abolished, and the synodical polity established in its place. In the course of this revolution, the vindictive fury of the populace was expressed in outrages upon the Episcopal clergy, who suffered numerous indignities. In the language of the time, they were "rabbled."

Henry IV., at the time of his death, was just ready to intervene in the affairs of Germany, in pursuance of the traditional French policy, which looked to the reduction of the power of Austria, and the enlargement of the boundaries of France. In the ten years that followed his death, after Sully had retired from office, when the government was in the hands of Mary de Medici, the factions which had been held in restraint were once more let loose, and the path which Henry had entered was for the time abandoned.

To maintain an alliance with Spain, which was to be cemented by a double matrimonial connection, was the purpose of the Queen. Nobles who were disaffected with the government courted the support of the Huguenots from interested motives. These influences, in conjunction with the various sorts of persecution to which they were constantly subject, by the permission, if not at the instigation of the government, and through the hostile preaching of the Jesuits, kept the Huguenot churches in a state of perpetual alarm and discontent. Their counsels were divided, some advising a resort to arms, and others, like the aged Du Plessis Mornay, advising patience. The invasion of Lower Navarre and Bearn by the King, in 1620, the seizure of Church property, which had been

long in the hands of the Protestants, and the infliction of atrocious cruelties upon them moved the National Synod, in 1621, by a small majority, to decide upon war. The Huguenots, a great part of whom remained passive and neutral, were worsted, but the successful resistance of Montauban, and, in the next year, of Montpellier, led to a treaty in which the Protestants were confirmed in the possession of their religious rights, and Montauban and Rochelle were still left in their hands. Their peculiar circumstances gave them more and more the character of a political party, with which malcontents of all shades would naturally ally themselves within the kingdom, and which would borrow strength by a connection with the Protestants of other countries. A spirit of hostility to the Crown and a love of independence would naturally grow in the Huguenot ranks; and this took place at the very time when the Crown was entering upon the work of fully subjugating feudalism.[1]

With the reign of Louis XIII., and the administration of Richelieu, there was a return, as regards foreign affairs, to the policy of Henry IV. The aim of Richelieu (1624–1642), as far as the government of France was concerned, was to consolidate the monarchy, by bringing the aristocracy into thorough subjection to the King, and by inflicting a deadly blow on the old spirit of feudal independence. Under him began the process of centralization, of officers appointed and paid by the government, which was fully developed in France after the great Revolution. His policy involved the annihilation of the Huguenot party, as a distinct political organization, a state within the state; and this he accomplished when La Rochelle, the last of their towns, fell into his hands (1628).

The foreign policy of Richelieu receives the general applause of Frenchmen; not so his domestic rule. The interests of the State must prevail over every other consideration. This was his first maxim. To this end, absolute obedience must be exacted of all orders of men, and disobedience be punished with unrelenting severity. The Prince must allow no interference of the Church or the Pope with the rights of the civil authority. Nobles must be prevented from oppressing the people and must serve the State in war. The Judges in Parliament must be kept from interfering with the prerogatives of the Crown. The

[1] De Félice, *Hist. d. Prot. d. France*, p. 307.

people must be kept in absolute subjection, and be subject to burdens not so heavy as to crush them, nor so light as to induce them to forget their subordination. Care should rather be had for the culture and instruction of a part of the nation than of the whole, which might be mischievous.[1] Richelieu abolished anarchy, but he made it possible for the selfish and ruinous despotism of Louis XIV. to arise in its place. His destruction of the political power of the Huguenots left them open to the deadly assaults of rulers more fanatical than himself. Had he been inclined, or if inclined, had he been able, to draw the Huguenot power on his side, and to use it against Spain, the final result might have been happier for France.[2] In truth, the capture of La Rochelle gave an impulse to the emigration of Protestants, and France began to lose the most valuable portion of its population.[3] Abroad, Richelieu joined with Sweden and with the Protestants of Germany in making war upon the Hapsburg dynasty, and succeeded in his double purpose of breaking down the imperial power, and amplifying the territory of France. The work of Richelieu was carried forward in the same spirit by Mazarin, in the early part of the reign of Louis XIV. The design of this monarch was to make himself an absolute ruler in France, even in ecclesiastical affairs, without an actual separation from the Papacy; in other words, to imitate Henry VIII., as far as was compatible with maintaining the connection of the French Church with Rome; and, in relation to foreign powers, he aspired to be the dictator in the European commonwealth. His quarrel with the Pope, his persecution of the Jansenists, and his persecution of the Huguenots are the three principal events in his domestic religious policy. His controversy with Innocent X. grew out of the King's attempt to extend the right called *la régale* — that

[1] Richelieu's political Testament is well epitomized by Häusser, p. 586. Of the part taken by Richelieu in the composition of the Testament and Memoirs, see Ranke, v. 137 seq., Martin, xi. 591 seq.

[2] Martin says of the Huguenot party that it retarded the encroaching wave of despotism. "Mieux eût valu lancer les Rochelois sur l'Espagne que de les détruire. Richelieu n'abusa point de sa victoire, mais il rendit facile à un autre d'en abuser après lui; La Rochelle debout, ou n'eût osé restaurer l'ère des persécutions et révoquer l'édit de Nantes." xi. 307. Michelet observes that Henry IV. and Richelieu both aimed at national unity, but by different means — the first by the use, the second by the destruction, of the vital forces. *Hist. de France*, xi. 461. Upon Richelieu's personal traits, see Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, xxiii. 1 seq. Ranke judges him more favorably.

[3] Smiles, *The Huguenots in England*, etc., 1867.

is, the right to appropriate the revenues of a see and temporarily fill the vacancy, until a new incumbent should take the oath of fidelity to the King — to extend this prerogative over Burgundy, the old English portion of France, and portions of the kingdom where the privilege in question belonged to the local ecclesiastical authorities. He required the vassals' oath of the bishops in these districts, and they were supported in their refusal to grant it by the Pope. Under the pontificate of Innocent XI. the Assembly of the French Clergy, in 1682, supporting the views of the King, passed the famous four propositions of Gallican liberty: that the Pope has authority only in spiritual matters, not over kings and princes; that the authority of a General Council is above that of the Pope; that the Pope is bound by the Church laws, and by the particular institutions and usages of the French Church; and that the doctrinal decisions of the Pope are not irreformable, unless they are supported by the concurrence of the whole Church. The long controversy was at length adjusted by an accommodation, under Innocent XII., in which Louis retained his prerogative, which had formed the original subject of dispute, but gave up the four propositions. He allowed bishops to retract their assent to them, but would not suffer them to be compelled to do so. Bossuet had assumed the post of a literary champion of the Gallican theory, in behalf of the King; but, in consequence of the settlement just referred to, his celebrated work against the ultramontane type of Catholicism did not see the light until 1730.

Jansenism was a reaction within the Catholic Church, against the theology, casuistry, and general spirit of the Jesuit order. Molina and other theologians set up a middle type of doctrine between the system of Augustine and that of Pelagius. The Molinists ingeniously reserved to the will a coöperative part in conversion. Jansenism was a revival of the Augustinian tenets upon the inability of the fallen will and upon efficacious grace. In this respect the Jansenists were on the same path as the Reformers; but, unlike these, instead of going back of the Fathers in order to abide by the teaching of Scripture, they rested upon patristic authority and were content to follow implicitly the great founder of Latin theology.[1] Bajus, professor

[1] Ranke, *History of the Popes*, iii. 143 seq.

at Louvain, towards the end of the sixteenth century, led the way in this reassertion of Augustinian principles. But it was Jansenius, also a professor at Louvain and Bishop of Ypres, and his fellow-student, Duvergier, Abbot of St. Cyran, who subsequently gave a new impetus to the movement. St. Cyran, Pascal, Arnauld, Nicole, and their associates, who were called Port Royalists, from their relation to the cloister of that name, became the leaders of the party. If we glance at the Jesuit fraternity as it was in the middle of the seventeenth century, we find that its character had altered for the worse.[1] Its professed members were no longer confined to spiritual duties, but shared with the coadjutors the management of colleges and the administration of secular affairs. The religious fervor that had existed earlier was very much cooled. The obligation to renounce property, as a private possession, was evaded. A "mercantile spirit" crept even into the institutions of education which had been established by the order. In the room of defending the Papacy, it generally sided with France in the contests with the Holy See. By the policy adopted in its Asiatic missions, the Jesuit order at length came into conflict with the Capuchins and Franciscans, as it had offended the Dominicans by opposing the doctrines of Thomas Aquinas. The Jesuits gradually ceased to be absorbed in a great object, the restoration of the Papal dominion and the extension of it over the globe, and directed their energies to the preservation of their own power. But it was their lax ethical maxims which, more than any other cause, undermined their reputation. The "Provincial Letters" of Pascal, in which their loose casuistry was chastised with the keenest satire, inflicted upon them a deadly wound. While the Jansenists, who were in favor of the independence of the Church, in opposition to ultramontane usurpations, supported the King in his conflict with the Pope, they enjoyed the royal favor; but when they set themselves against his effort to bring the Church under his feet, he turned against them and gave his ear to the inimical suggestions of the Jesuits. Finally, in 1710, he pulled down the cloister of Port Royal, and banished the Jansenist leaders. In 1708 Clement XI. had issued a bull, prohibiting the "Moral Reflections" of Quesnel, a work which had been approved by Bossuet

[1] Ranke, iii. 131 seq.

and by Noailles, the Archbishop of Paris. This was followed by a heavier blow at the Jansenist party in 1713, in the form of the famous bull, *Unigenitus*, which explicitly condemned one hundred and one propositions of the same book. The Pope was forced into this action by the French Court, under the influence of Father Le Tellier, who had declared that there were more than a hundred censurable propositions in the book. Clement was obliged to make good the declaration by condemning one hundred and one. It was not the Jansenists alone, but all true Gallicans, who were attacked in these proceedings. This controversy was continued in the next reign, after the death of Louis XIV., between the *Opposants* or *Appellants* on the one hand, and the *Acceptants* or *Constitutionaires*, the adversaries of the Jansenists, on the other. The Papal authority was brought to bear against the Jansenist opinions, in subservience to the dictation of the Court, and this coercion had a demoralizing effect upon the French clergy, many of whom were forced into a denial of their real convictions. The Jansenists survived in the separatist archiepiscopal Church of Utrecht, and still more in combination with the tendencies to liberalism, out of which grew the political and religious revolutions that marked the close of the eighteenth century.[1]

The Huguenots, under Richelieu and Mazarin, had been protected in their religious freedom. It was only as a political organization that these statesmen had made war upon them. After the death of Mazarin, in 1661, a party that was hostile to the Protestants gained an increasing influence over the King, whose personal vices were attended with forebodings of remorse, and with superstitious anxieties that sought relief in the persecution of heresy. He fell under the influence of his Jesuit Confessor, La Chaise, with whom were joined the war-minister, the Marquis de Louvois, and even Madam Maintenon, his wife, formerly a Protestant. Hence the great attempt to make proselytes by the use of all varieties of cruelty. "For many years," says Martin, the government of Louis XIV. "had been acting towards the Reformation as towards a victim entangled in a noose, which is drawn tighter and tighter till it strangles its prey." Declarations and edicts of the most oppressive character had followed one another in rapid succession. At length

[1] Niedner, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 751.

the atrocious scheme of the *dragonade*, or the billeting of soldiers in Huguenot families, was resorted to. Over the pretended conversions effected by such means the profligate rulers of France sang praises to God. Louis XIV. endeavored to quiet his own fear of hell by making a hell for his unoffending subjects. The penalty of death was denounced against all converts who relapsed to the Huguenot faith. In the course of three years fifty thousand families had fled from the country. In 1685 the Edict of Nantes, the great charter of Protestant rights, was revoked. The churches of the Huguenots were seized; and although emigration was forbidden to the laity, not far from a quarter of a million of refugees escaped to enrich Protestant countries to which they removed by their skill and industry. Many remained firm under the severest trials, and assembled in forests and by-places to celebrate their worship. It was not until 1788 that their marriages, which had been treated as invalid, were pronounced legal; and they did not gain their rights in full until the Revolution.

"France was impoverished," writes Martin, "not only in Frenchmen who exiled themselves, but in those much more numerous, who remained, in spite of themselves, discouraged, ruined, whether they openly resisted persecution, or suffered some external observances of Catholicism to be wrung from them, all having neither energy in work or security in life; it was really the activity of more than a million of men that France lost, and of the million that produced most." It is a significant fact, in the light of subsequent events, that many of the refugees were received by the Elector Frederic, and helped to build up Berlin, then a small city of twelve thousand inhabitants.

After the close of the war of the Spanish Succession (1713), at the instigation of Le Tellier, who had succeeded La Chaise as a kind of minister of ecclesiastical affairs, the persecution against the Protestants was renewed, in forms of aggravated and ingenious cruelty.

In his foreign policy Louis XIV. succeeded brilliantly for a time, but was doomed to terrible disappointment and defeat. He made himself as formidable by his power and ambition as Philip II. had been in the latter part of the preceding century; and like him he was destined to experience a mortifying failure, as well as to lay the foundation of untold calamities for his

nation. His attack on the Spanish Netherlands, which were regarded by Holland as a bulwark against his inroads and aggression, led to the triple alliance of Holland, England, and Sweden, in 1668, the object of which was to compel him to conclude a peace with Spain. The same year he concluded with Spain the peace of Aix la Chapelle. The resentment of Louis against Holland led him to form, in 1670, the secret treaty with Charles II., in behalf of Catholicism and absolutism. But the unpopularity of the war against Holland among the English, and the necessity under which Charles was placed, of making peace with the Dutch, together with a like course on the part of other allies of Louis, led to the treaty of Nimeguen in 1678–1679, by which he gained a number of towns and fortresses in the Netherlands, besides certain German places. Holland was left in the same state as before the war. The continued aggressions of Louis occasioned the grand alliance of the European powers against him and the war of ten years, in which William of Orange was the foremost leader among the allies. In the early part of the previous war, when Holland was overrun by the French armies and reduced almost to despair, the Republican magistrates were overthrown and the government placed in the hands of William. By him the courage of the nation had been roused, and, as the only means of defense, they had cut through the dykes and inundated the country. Thenceforward William was the most determined and dangerous antagonist of Louis, and the moving spirit of the coalitions formed against him. In the peace of Ryswick, in 1697, Louis renounced his support of the Stuarts, and admitted William III. to be the rightful King of Great Britain and Ireland. The war of the Spanish succession, in which Louis sought to supplant the Austrian House in Spain and to combine Spain with France, by placing his grandson, Philip, Duke of Anjou, on the Spanish throne, was closed in 1713 by the peace of Utrecht. It was provided that France and Spain should never be united under one sovereign; the Spanish Netherlands were transferred to Austria; and the Bourbon Prince was left on the throne of Spain, and his title was acknowledged by the allies in 1714. The "grand monarch" came out of the wars which had been kindled by his ambition, thwarted and reduced to distress. A significant feature of the peace of Utrecht was the recognition

of the Elector of Brandenburg as King of Prussia. As Sweden sank down from the eminence which it held for a time, as the leading Protestant power in the North, Prussia was rising to take her place.

The reign of Louis XIV. effected the utter paralysis and prostration of the Catholic Reaction. The Popes found themselves unable to contend with the temporal power.[1] The disposition of several pontiffs to favor the side of Spain and Austria sharpened the antagonism between them and the French king, and subjected them to humiliation. When Clement XI. abandoned the anti-French policy, he was obliged to succumb to the threats of the imperialists. Treaties of peace were concluded between the European nations, in which the interests and even rights of the Popes were involved, but in regard to which they were not consulted. The Church of France remained Catholic; it was even guilty of a revolting persecution; but it united with the monarch in abridging the power and thwarting the designs of the Holy See. Not only was the Catholic world divided into two parties, the Austrian and French, which the Pope could not control, but the Protestant States acquired a preponderance of power; and the Court of Innocent XI. naturally sympathized with the coalition, although its forces were predominantly Protestant, the end of which was to curb the ambition of Louis XIV.

Even the persecuting measures which Louis XIV. adopted ostensibly in behalf of the Catholic religion were in the highest degree harmful to it; for the hatred of these atrocious proceedings contributed to swell the current of antipathy to the Church and to religion, which was gathering force in the minds of men. The Bull *Unigenitus*, as it condemned Jansenism and Augustinian doctrine, brought the Jesuits into alliance with the Papal See. But this Bull, with the cognate measures, divided the clergy and excited all the elements of opposition to the Papal supremacy over the Gallican Church. The Jansenists became virtual auxiliaries of the rising party, in whom the spirit of innovation had full sway.

Louis XIV. died in 1715. Voltaire was then about twenty-one years old. The age of philosophy and illuminism, of religious and political revolutions, was approaching. The third

[1] Ranke, iii. 156.

estate, the middle class, was preparing to grasp the power which had been wrested from the nobles and concentrated in the throne. Free-thinking, transplanted from England, was taking root and spreading through all orders of French society, thence to be diffused over Europe. The fabric of political and religious despotism which Louis XIV. had erected, was to go down before the end of the century in a revolutionary tempest.

CHAPTER XIII

THE PROTESTANT THEOLOGY

PROTESTANTISM, under whatever diversities of form it appeared, and notwithstanding the varieties of character and of opinion which are observed among its leaders, is distinguished as a system of belief by two principles. These are justification by faith alone, and the exclusive authority of the Scriptures.[1]

The subject round which the Protestant discussions revolved, and out of which they originally sprang, is the reconciliation of man to God. The controversy with the Roman Catholics did not relate to the branches of theology on which the ancient councils had spoken. The Apostolic symbol, the creeds of Nicæa and Chalcedon, were accepted in common by both parties. In respect to the Trinity and the person of Christ they stood on the same ground. On the subject of Anthropology, the doctrine of sin, it is true that the Reformers earnestly asserted the Augustinian views, in opposition to that modified opinion, less hostile to the Pelagian tenet, which had

[1] Among the books of reference respecting the Protestant and the Catholic Theology are the Collections of Creeds; the Lutheran (edited by Hase, 1846); *The Book of Concord, or the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, edited by Prof. H. E. Jacobs (pp. 672), Philadelphia, 1882. The Reformed (by Niemeyer, 1840); The Roman Catholic (by Streitwolf u. Kleiner, 1846). See, also, Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (1877). Calvin's *Institutes* and Melancthon's *Loci Communes* are the principal doctrinal treatises on the Protestant side in the age of the Reformation. Bellarmine is still the ablest controversialist on the Catholic side since the Tridentine Council; *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianæ Fidei adv. hujus Temporis hæreticos* (Rome, 1581, 1582, 1593). The ablest antagonists of Bellarmine were Martin Chemnitz, *Examen Concil Trid.* (1565–73), and the Huguenot theologian, Chamier, *Panstratiæ Catholicæ*, etc. (Geneva, 1626; Frankfort, 1629). A convenient manual of Catholic Theology is Perrone, *Prælectiones Theologicæ* (2 vols., 1847). Among the modern works on Protestant Theology are Planck, *Gsch. d. prot. Lehrbegriffs* (1781–1800); Gass, *Gsch. d. prot. Dogmatik* (1862); A. Schweizer, *Die prot. Central-dogmen innerhalb d. ref. Kirche* (1854); Heppe, *Dogmatik d. deutsch Prot.* (1857); Dorner, *Gsch. d. prot. Theol.* (1867); Schenkel, *Das Wesen d. Prot.* (1846). Karl Hase, *Handbuch d. Protestantischen Polemik* (1871). See, also, Werner, *Gsch. d. kath. Theol. seit d. Trid. Conc.* (1866). To these are to be added numerous modern works on Symbolics and on the History of Doctrine, by Neander, Harnack, Klee (Roman Cath.), Baumgarten-Crusius, Hagenbach, Schaff, Baur, Möhler (Rom. Cath.), Fisher (G. P.), Nitzsch (1870), Winer, Shedd, Sheldon, Schmid (4. ed. Hauck), 1887.

been distinctly espoused by one of the leading mediæval schools, the followers of Scotus, and had affected all of the scholastic systems. It was in their profound sense of the reality of sin, and of its dominion in the human will, that the Protestants laid the foundations of their theology. Zwingli alone, of all the foremost Reformers, called in question the fact of native guilt, as this is asserted in the Augustinian theology; and even he did not adhere uniformly to his theory. But the doctrine of sin was only indirectly and subordinately brought into the debate.[1] The same might be said of the Atonement, since the body of the Reformers rested on the Anselmic idea of satisfaction, which likewise formed a part of the opposing creed.[2] The point of difference was on the vital question how the soul, burdened with self-condemnation, is to obtain the forgiveness of sins and peaceful reunion to God in the character of a reconciled father. In the teachings, injunctions, services, ceremonies of the Church, the Reformers had sought for this infinite good in vain. They found it in the doctrine of gratuitous pardon, from the bare mercy of God, through the mediation of Christ; a pardon that waits for nothing but acceptance on the part of the soul — the belief, the trust, the faith of the penitent. Everything of the nature of satisfaction or merit on the part of the offender is precluded, by the utterly gratuitous nature of the gift, by the sufficiency of the Redeemer's expiation. Every assertion of the necessity of works or merit on the side of the offender, as the ground of forgiveness, is a disparagement of the Redeemer's mercy and of his expiatory office. Faith, thus laying hold of a free forgiveness and reconnecting the soul with God, is the fountain of a new life of holiness, which de-

[1] The Protestants held that the moral perfections — that is, the holiness — of the first man are concreated; the Catholics, that they are superadded gifts of grace. *Cat. Rom.*, I. ii. qu. 19. This doctrine of the *donum supernaturale* is drawn out in full by Bellarmine, *Grat. primi Hom.*, ii. The effect of the fall is said by the Catholics to be the loss of the *donum supernaturale*, and a consequent, though indirect, weakening of the natural powers (*vulnera naturæ*); by the Protestants it was held to be a positive depravation of human nature. Bellarmine, *Amis. Grat.*, III. i.; *Conf. August.*, p. 9; *Apol. August. Conf.*, p. 51; *Conf. Helvet.*, II. cc. viii., ix.

[2] The doctrine common to Anselm and Aquinas that the satisfaction of Christ is absolute in itself, and infinite, was denied only by the school of Scotus, who held that it is finite, but is accepted by the divine will — *acceptilatio* — for more than its intrinsic worth. The Tridentine creed denies that pardon carries with it the remission of all punishment; but asserts that the satisfaction rendered by the sinner is available only through the satisfaction of Christ. Sess. xiv. c. viii. See Baumgarten-Crusius, *Dogmengsch.*, ii. 273, n. *a*.

pends not on fear and homage to law, but on gratitude and on filial sentiments. Christ himself nourishes this new life by spiritual influences that flow into the soul through the channel of its fellowship with Him. Justification is thus a forensic term; it is equivalent to the remission of sins. To justify, signifies not to make the offender righteous, but to treat him as if he were righteous, to deliver him from the accusation of the law by the bestowal of a pardon. Saving faith is not a virtue to be rewarded, but an apprehensive act, the hand that takes the free gift. Such, in a brief statement, was the cardinal principle of the Protestant interpretation of the Gospel.[1] The Christian life has its center in this experience of forgiveness. Virtues of character and victories over temptation grow out of it. Christian ethics is united to Christian theology by this vital bond.

But to what authority could the Reformers appeal in behalf of their proposition? What assurance had they of its truth? How did they arrive at the knowledge of it? They had found this obscured and half-forgotten truth recorded, as they believed, with perfect clearness, in the Scriptures. The authority of the Scriptures was fully acknowledged by the Church in which they had been trained, however it might superadd to them other authoritative sources of knowledge, and however it might deny the competence of the individual to interpret the Bible for himself. That Christ spoke in the Scriptures, all admitted. What His voice was the Reformers could not doubt; for the truth that He uttered was one of which they had an immediate, spiritual recognition. Their interpretation verified itself to their hearts by the light and peace which that truth brought with it, as well as to their understandings on a critical examination of the text. The Church, then, that denied their interpretation and commanded them to abandon it was in error; it could not be the authorized, infallible interpreter of Holy Writ. Thus the traditional belief in the authority of the Roman Church gave way, and the principle of the exclusive authority of the Scriptures, as the rule of faith, took its place. By this process the second of the distinctive principles of Protes-

[1] This idea of justification is the keynote in Luther's Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, and in Melancthon's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. It is the distinctive feature of the Protestant exegesis of the writings of St. Paul.

tantism was reached. That the meaning of the Bible is sufficiently plain and intelligible was implied in this conclusion. Hence, the right of private judgment is another side of the same doctrine.

In the adoption of this, which has been called the formal, in distinction from the first, which is termed the material, principle of Protestantism, there was no dissent among the churches of the reformed faith. Thus the Anglican body, which surpassed all other Protestant churches in its deference to the fathers and to the first centuries, affirms this principle. It accepts, in the eighth article, the ancient creeds, on the ground that they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture; it declares, in the nineteenth article, that the Church of Rome, as well as the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred in matters of faith; and in the twenty-first article it asserts that general councils may err and have erred in things pertaining to the rule of piety, and that their decrees are to be accepted no farther than they can be shown to be conformable to the sacred writings.

The two principles are united in the fundamental idea of the direct relation of Christ to the believer as his personal Redeemer and Guide.

The Roman Catholic theory of Justification may be so stated as to seem to approximate closely to that of the Protestants; but on a close examination, the two doctrines are seen to be discordant with one another. In the formula which defines the condition of salvation to be faith formed by love — *fides formata caritate* — a separation between faith and love is conceived of, in which the latter becomes the adjunct of the former; and inasmuch as love is the injunction of the law, a door is open for a theory of works and human merit, and for all the discomforts of that legal and introspective piety from which the evangelical doctrine furnished the means of escape. Faith, in the Protestant view, is necessarily the source of good works, which flow from it as a stream from a fountain; which grow from it as fruit from a tree. The tendency of the Catholic system is to conjoin works with faith, and thus to resolve good works into a form of legal obedience. Moreover, Justification does not begin as in the Protestant theology, with the forgiveness of sins; but the first element in Justification is the infusion of inward, per-

sonal righteousness, and pardon follows. Justification is gradual.[1] By this incipient excellence of character, the Christian is made capable of meriting grace; and however this doctrine may be qualified and guarded by founding all merit ultimately on the merits of Christ, from which the sanctification of the disciple flows, the legal characteristic cleaves to the doctrine. But the wide difference of the Catholic conception from the Protestant becomes evident, when it is remembered that according to the former, for all sins committed after baptism, the offender owes and must render satisfaction — a satisfaction that derives its efficacy, to be sure, from that made by Christ, but yet is not the less indispensable and real. And how is Justification imparted? How does it begin? It is communicated through baptism, and, hence, generally, in infancy. It is Justification by baptism rather than by faith; and for all sins subsequently committed, penances are due; satisfaction must be offered by the transgressor himself. We are thus brought to the whole theory of the Church and of the Sacraments, in which the discrepancy between the two theologies is most manifest.

If the conflict of the two theologies were limited to this topic of Justification and of the relation of faith to works; if the dispute could be shut up to subtle questions and tenuous distinctions of theological science, it might be more easily settled. On these questions a meeting-point might possibly be found. But the Protestant interpretation of the Gospel involved a denial of the prerogatives of the vast Institution which assumed to intervene between the soul and God, as the almoner of grace and the ruler of the beliefs and lives of men.

The Reformers, in harmony with their idea of the way of salvation which has been described, brought forward the conception of the invisible Church. The true Church, they said, is composed of all believers in Christ, all who are spiritually united in Him; and of the Church as thus defined, He is the Head. This is the Holy Catholic Church, to which the Apostles' Creed refers, and in which the disciple professes his belief; "for we believe," said Luther, referring to this passage of the creed, "not in what we see, but in what is invisible." The visible Church, on the contrary, is a congregation of believers in which the word of God is preached and the sacraments administered essentially as

[1] Concil. Trident Sess. VI. c. X.

they were instituted by Christ. But no single visible body of Christians can justly assume to be the entire Church; much less exclude from the pale of salvation all who are not included in their number. The true Church is an ideal, which is realized but imperfectly in any existing organization. External societies of Christians are more or less pure; they approximate, in different degrees, to a conformity to the idea of the real or invisible community. The Protestants carefully refrained from arrogating for the bodies which they organized an exclusive title to be considered the Church. When charged with being apostates from the Church, and when themselves denouncing the Papacy as the embodiment of Antichrist, they never denied that the true Church of Christ was on the side of their opponents, as well as with themselves. "I say," said Luther, "that under the Pope is real Christianity, yea the true pattern of Christianity, and many pious, great saints." Calvin has similar expressions; for example, in his noted Letter to Sadolet.

The Roman Catholic theory affixes the attributes of unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity to the external, visible society of which the Bishop of Rome is the chief, and declares that outside of this body there is no salvation. The notes of the true Church belong to this society; and accordingly the promises made in the New Testament to the Church, and the privileges there ascribed to it, are claimed for this body exclusively. The Church, says Bellarmine, is something as tangible as the Republic of Venice. In opposition to the second of the Protestant principles, the traditions of the oral teaching of Christ and of the Apostles, which, it is claimed, are infallibly preserved in the Church, through the supernatural aid of the indwelling Spirit, are put on a level with Scripture, and of Scripture itself, the Church is the appointed, unerring expounder. It was not an uncommon thing in the Middle Ages for doctrines to be attributed to revelations made to the Church, subsequent to the Apostolic age; doctrines not supposed to be contained in the Scriptures. But the prevailing Catholic doctrine since the Reformation finds the entire revelation as a complete deposit, in the written and oral teaching of Christ and the Apostles. The connection of the individual with Christ is not possible, except through his connection with the Church. In the Catholic theory the invisible Church is not only included in the visible organiza-

tion in communion with the Papal See, but it cannot exist out of it or apart from it.[1]

As an inseparable part of the Catholic theory of the Church stands the doctrine of a particular priesthood and of the sacraments. The idea of the sacraments was fully developed by the Schoolmen, and the number, which had been indefinite and variable, was fixed at seven. It is essential to the conception of the sacrament that it should efficiently convey the hidden gift of grace which it symbolizes. It is the channel through which the grace is communicated; the ordained and indispensable vehicle by which it passes to the individual; the instrument by the direct operation of which the divine mercy reaches the soul.[2] Hence the efficacy of a sacrament is independent of the personal character of the administrator, provided he have the intention to perform the sacramental act; for such an intention is requisite. The sacrament, moreover, imparts a divine gift which is not involved in, nor produced by, the faith of the recipient: it is *ex opere operato*. The effect is wrought, in case the recipient interposes no obstacle.[3] The sacraments are

[1] In the later editions of his *Loci*, Melancthon treats of the visible church alone. He was led to this course, not by a change of opinion respecting the reality of the conception of the invisible Church, but in consequence of the aberrations, in a spiritualistic direction, of the Anabaptists. He is concerned to guard against the notion that the invisible Church is a mere ideal, or is to be sought for outside of all existing ecclesiastical organizations — a mere Platonic republic. See Julius Müller, *Dogmatische Abhandlungen* (Die unsichtbare Kirche), pp. 297, 298.

[2] "Per quæ omnis vera justitia vel incipit, vel coepta augetur, vel amissa reparatur." Concil. Trid. Sess. vii. Proemium. "Si quis dixerit sacramenta novæ legis non esse ad salutem necessaria;" "si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, anathema sit." *Ibid.*, iv. viii.

[3] This is the declaration of the Council of Trent (sess. vii. can. vi.): "Si quis dixerit sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam, quam significat; aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non confere . . . anathema sit." The later Schoolmen taught that the Sacraments are efficacious, unless a mortal sin creates an obstacle in the way of the working of divine grace. Duns Scotus (l. iv. d. 1. qu. 6) says: "Non requiritur ibi bonus motus interior, qui mereatur gratiam," etc. Gabriel Biel (*Sententt*, l. iv. d. 1. qu. 3.) maintains the same proposition. It is this tenet which the Reformers attacked. After the Reformation, Bellarmine says (*De Sacr.*, ii. 1.): "Voluntas, fides et poenitentia in suscipiente adulto necessario requiruntur ex parte subjecti," etc. Möhler (*Symbolik*, c. iv. § 28) reaffirms this last doctrine. One of the first propositions which Cajetan required Luther to retract was: Non sacramentum, sed fides in sacramento justificat. The modification of the Catholic representation on this point since the Reformation, is referred to by Winer, *Comparative Darstellung*, p. 126; Hase, *Prot. Polemik*, p. 350 seq. See also Nitzsch, *Prot. Beantwortung auf Möhler* (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1834, p. 853). It is still to be observed, however, that the "fides," which Bellarmine requires in the recipient of the sacrament, is not faith, in the Protestant sense, but the assent to doctrinal truth.

As to the "intention" in the priest which is requisite to the validity of the sacrament, some make it external — an intention to do, as to the outward form of the

the means of grace, and are essential to the beginning and growth of the Christian life; they meet the individual at his birth and attend him to his burial. They are to the soul and the religious life what bread is to the body; nor is their effect confined to the soul; it extends even to the physical nature. In the Sacrament of the Altar, the body and blood of Christ are literally present. Christ is once more offered, an unbloody sacrifice, through which the benefits of the sacrifice on the cross are obtained and appropriated. In the converted substance of the wafer, the recipient actually partakes of the Redeemer's body. The sacrifice of the Mass is the central act of worship.

Of course this conception of the sacraments presupposes a consecrated priesthood, a hierarchical order, which is authorized to dispense them. They stand in the position of mediators, from whose hands the means of salvation must be received; by whom, acting in a judicial capacity, penances, or the temporal punishments due to mortal sin after repentance and confession, are appointed; and who have it in their power to pronounce against contumacious offenders the awful sentence of excommunication, which blots their names out of the book of life. Between the individual and Christ stands a fully organized self-perpetuating body of priests, through whose offices alone the soul can come into the possession of the blessings of salvation. It is true that baptism, without which one cannot be saved — unless, indeed, the intention to receive it is prevented from being carried out, without the candidate's fault — may be performed by unconsecrated hands, in emergencies where no priest can be summoned. But the other sacraments, Confirmation, the Lord's Supper, the allotment of Penance and Absolution, Marriage, Ordination, Extreme Unction, belong exclusively to the priest, and have no validity unless performed by him. Standing thus, not as a member on a level with the general congregation of believers, but as an intermediate link between the body of believers and God, the priest is naturally subject to the rule

sacrament, what the Church does; while others make it "internal" — an intention to fulfill the end or design of the sacrament. The Council of Trent leaves the point doubtful. Sess. VII. xi. Perrone, one of the most eminent of the later Catholic theologians, holds to the necessity of the "internal" intention. *Prælectiones Theolog.*, ii. 118 (p. 232). This is more commonly considered to be most consonant with the Tridentine declaration. Klee, *Dogmengeschichte*, ii. 132. Thus a secret intention of the priest may deprive the recipient of the benefit of a sacrament.

of celibacy. He stands aloof from the ordinary relations of this earthly life.[1]

In direct opposition to this theory of a sacerdotal class, the Protestants maintained the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers. The laity stand in no such dependence on a priestly order. Every disciple has the right of immediate access to God; none can debar him from a direct approach to the Redeemer. The officers of the Church are set apart among their brethren for the performance of certain duties; but the clergy are not a distinct and superior order, clothed with mediatorial functions. The idea of the direct relation of the soul to Christ, which is involved in the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and in that of the general, as opposed to a particular, priesthood, carried with it an essential modification of the previous doctrine of the sacraments. The sufficiency of the sacrifice once made dispensed with such a supplement as was sought in the repeated sacrifice of the Mass; and transubstantiation was rejected as a gross perversion of the Scriptural and primitive doctrine. The sacraments were declared to be but two in number, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The other five had been added to the number without warrant of Scripture. Of these, extreme unction was set aside as an unauthorized superstition. Marriage might be concluded without the intervention of a priest. Penances vanished with the doctrine of human merit; and auricular confession, instead of being a duty owed to the priest, an obligation to recount to him all remembered sins of a heinous character, was resolved into the general privilege which disciples enjoy, of confessing to one another their faults, for the purpose of receiving from brethren rebuke, counsel, and comfort. Moreover the efficacy of the sacraments was made dependent on the spiritual state of the communicant, or the disposition with which they were received. Everything like a magical efficiency was denied to them; without faith, the sacrament of the Supper brought no benefit.[2] But while the Protestants held that the

[1] Neander, *Catholicismus u. Protestantismus*, p. 210.

[2] Yet both Lutherans and Calvinists held that in the sacraments the outward sign represents the inward operation of the Holy Spirit, which gives to the sacrament its efficacy. Thus in the Conf. Belgica (art. xxxiii.) it is said of the sacraments: "Per quæ ceu media deus virtute spiritus sancti in nobis operatur." In the Conf. Helv. ii. (xix.) it is said of the sacraments: "Signa et res significatæ inter se sacramentaliter conjunguntur, conjunguntur, inquam, ve uniuntur per significationem mysticam et voluntatem vel consilium ejus, qui sacramenta constituit." See, also, *Conf. Angl.*, art. xxv.; *Conf. Gall.*, art. xxxiv.; *Cat. Genev.*, p. 519.

validity and use of the sacraments are not dependent on the personal character of the officiating minister, they also asserted that they are equally independent of his secret intention. They recoiled from the doctrine that the priest, by a contrary intention, may annul the effect of the sacraments; whereby it is always left in some degree uncertain whether they are in fact received.

With the Catholic doctrine of penance, or temporal punishments following upon the remission of mortal sin, the doctrine of purgatory also disappeared, and consequently that of the lawfulness or need of prayers for the dead. The invocation of the Virgin and of the saints was connected with ideas concerning the character of Christ which were at variance with the Protestant conception of his compassionate feeling and mediatorial relation; and such practices disappeared, almost of themselves. It is only in recent times that the immaculate conception of the Virgin has been proclaimed as a dogma; but the cultus of Mary, in the Middle Ages, especially under the auspices of the Franciscans, had been carried to a portentous height; and this exalted service offered to the mother of Jesus the Reformers discarded. The worship of images, or that homage to images which the Catholic theology permits, and the veneration of the relics of saints, vanished with the worship of the saints themselves, and was renounced likewise as a species of idolatry, or as involving a temptation to an idolatrous service. Pilgrimages and a great variety of ascetic usages were given up from their perceived inconsistency with the Protestant doctrine of justification, and of the liberty from ceremonial ordinances which is a corollary of that doctrine. It is a striking proof that the central principle of Protestantism is logically inconsistent with these practices, that they dropped off from the system of worship without any struggle in behalf of them, wherever that principle was intelligently received and professed. Monasticism, together with the celibacy of the clergy, as a compulsory rule, shared the same fate and on the same ground. As the Catholic theology made a distinction between mortal and venial sins, presenting thus a quantitative rather than a qualitative standard of conduct, which Protestantism rejected, so that theology made a distinction between two types of Christian character, the one being a salvable degree of excellence, such as is

gained by complying with the commandments of the Gospel, the other being the more exalted type of excellence, which is reached through compliance with the counsels or recommendations of the Gospel. On this distinction was founded the monastic system, with its three vows of poverty, chastity (including celibacy), and obedience. The Protestants rejected the distinction as belonging to a legal system at war with the spirit of Christian ethics, where the fundamental characteristic is not obedience to that which is exacted, but a free and willing and grateful self-consecration; where the question is not "how much must I," but "how much can I" do for the Saviour? For this reason they cast away also the rule of celibacy for the clergy, and for the additional reasons that it was one of the artificial barriers which had been set up to give a greater sanctity to the priesthood than of right belongs to the Christian ministry; that it puts a stigma upon the marriage institution; and that it had proved a source of corruption in the Church. Works of supererogation and the idea of a treasury of supererogatory merits of saints were cast away, as human inventions, which had sprung out of an eclipse of the truth that the merits of Christ are the sole and sufficient ground of salvation. With the abrogation of penances, and with the denial of purgatory, there was no room left for indulgences or for absolution, considered as a judicial act of the priest. Absolution, where it was retained by the Protestants, was a declaration of the forgiveness of the Gospel, not to an individual by himself, but to the assembly of believers, and was founded on a general not a detailed, on a common, not an auricular or private, confession of sin.

Of the theological divisions among the Protestants, the earliest and most noteworthy was the Sacramentarian controversy between the Lutherans on the one hand, and the Zwinglians first, and then the Calvinists, on the other; the controversy that raged in the first age of the Reformation. This has been described in preceding pages. The Arminian controversy, which is, perhaps, next in importance, related to the subject of predestination, and arose towards the close of the sixteenth century. The Reformers had followed Augustine in the assertion of unconditional predestination and election, which they assumed to be the correlate of salvation by grace alone. By Beza, the pupil of Calvin, who succeeded him at Geneva,

this doctrine was taught in the extreme, or what was called the supra-lapsarian form. Calvin, to say the least, had not uniformly inculcated this phase of the doctrine, according to which the first sin of man is the object of an efficient decree; the salvation of some and the condemnation of others being the supreme end in reference to which all the rest of the divine decrees are subordinate. But this type of doctrine spread extensively in the Reformed or Calvinistic branch of the Protestant Church. The followers of Melancthon adapted the doctrine of conditional predestination, in the room of the Augustinian view, and the Lutherans at length practically acquiesced in the same opinion. In Holland, therefore, where the Lutheran teaching was early introduced, there had been, before the time of Arminius, more or less dissent from the Calvinistic dogma. But this dissent first acquired strength through his influence. James Arminius, born at Oudewater, in 1560, was one of the most learned and accomplished theologians of the times. He studied at the University of Leyden, but received his education principally at Geneva, where he was under the instruction of Beza. After traveling in Italy, he returned to his native country, and in 1603 became Professor of Theology at Leyden, and a colleague of Gomarus, a strenuous advocate of the supra-lapsarian theory. This view Arminius had been called upon to defend against the preachers of Delft, who had avowed their adhesion to the milder, or infra-lapsarian form of the doctrine, according to which election has respect to men already fallen into a state of sin. But in the examination of the subject, into which Arminius was thus led, he came to sympathize with the opinion which he was set to oppose, and at length to go beyond it, and reject unconditional election altogether. In short, he gave up what had come to be considered the characteristic dogma of Calvinism. A dispute arose between him and Gomarus, and the debate spread through Holland. Episcopius, the learned successor of Arminius at Leyden, and Uytenbogaert, who had been a fellow-pupil of the former at Geneva, became the leaders of the party which the movement of Arminius had called into being. The main peculiarities of their creed were contained in the Remonstrance — which gave the name of Remonstrants to the party — that was addressed to the states of Holland and West Friesland

in 1610. This document embraces five points, namely, Election based on the foreknowledge of faith, universal Atonement, in the room of Atonement made for the elect only, the resistibility of Grace, in connection with the need of Regeneration by the Spirit, and the doubtfulness of the Calvinistic tenet of the perseverance of all believers.

A great political line of division was also run between the two theological parties. The Arminians were Republicans, and in favor of a closer union of Church and State, or a partial control of the State over the Church. The Calvinists adhered to the house of Orange, and were for the independence of the Church in relation to the State. In the progress of the conflict, Olden Barneveldt was beheaded, and Grotius, the illustrious ornament of the Arminian party, was banished. The Synod of Dort was assembled, in 1618, for the purpose of giving judgment upon this theological controversy. While this Synod declined to give an express sanction to the supra-lapsarian views of Gomarus, it declared its judgment in opposition to the Arminians on all the characteristic points of their system, and put forth, by way of antithesis, what have been called the five points of high Calvinism: unconditional election; limited atonement (designed for the elect alone); the complete impotency of the fallen will; irresistible grace; and the perseverance of believers. The Arminians introduced into their theology other deviations from the current system. In particular, they modified the accepted doctrine of Original Sin, excluding native guilt in the literal and proper sense of the term; and through the celebrated treatise of Grotius in answer to Socinus, and in the writings of other eminent theologians of the party, they substituted for the Anselmic doctrine of the Atonement what has been termed the governmental view.[1]

[1] Grotius meets the objections of Socinus by denying that atonement or satisfaction is the payment of a debt. The ruler is at liberty to pardon, provided public order is not endangered. The end of punishment is the prevention of future transgressions, or the security of the commonwealth. The death of Christ, in its moral effect, as a means to this end, is equivalent to the legal penalty, since it equally manifests God's hatred of sin. Hence it permits the ruler to pardon, on such conditions as he may judge it wise to impose. The seeds of the Grotian doctrine are in the Scotist theology, which affirmed that the atonement is not *intrinsically* the equivalent of the penalty, but takes its place by the divine acceptance or consent (acceptilatio); though Grotius, on verbal and technical grounds, repudiates this term. *Defensio Fidei Cathol. de Satisfactione Christi adv. F. Socinum* (1617). *Grotii Opera*, iv. 297.

The Arminian party, from the outset, cultivated Biblical studies with an earnest, scholarly spirit, and made important contributions in this branch of theological science. They were marked, partly as a natural consequence of the position of their party and of the persecution to which they were subject, by a liberal and tolerant disposition. They were in favor of reducing the doctrinal tests at the foundation of Christian union to the briefest possible compass. Indeed, a comparative indifference in respect to creeds, or a low estimate of their value, was one of their characteristic traits. The Arminian theology, besides the progress which it made in the country where it had its origin, by degrees supplanted Calvinism, for the most part, in the English Episcopal Church. It was adopted substantially by John Wesley, the principal founder of Methodism, and in this way won a numerous and powerful body of adherents.

In the ferment of thought and discussion which was produced by the Protestant movement, a new impetus, as well as liberty, was given to speculation. Slumbering tendencies of opinion were awakened to fresh life, and new sects sprang up, which were equally dissatisfied with the old Church and with the position taken by the Reformers.

Among the advocates of more radical changes who considered that the Protestant leaders had stopped halfway in their work, is that numerous and widely scattered class, which comprehended under itself many subordinate divisions, but which was known by the name of Anabaptists.[1] They received this title from their rejection, in common, of the baptism of infants, and from their insisting that those who joined them should be baptized anew. One prevailing feature of their system was a belief in immediate or prophetic inspiration, which, if it did not supersede the written Word, assimilated them to its authors. This was the position of the prophets who stirred up the commotion at Wittenberg, while Luther was at the Wartburg, and who gained over Carlstadt to their cause. One consequence of this form of enthusiasm was a contempt for human learning and for study. The immediate teaching of the Spirit renders the laborious exertions of the intellect superfluous. Another of their tenets was a belief in

[1] Erbkam, *Geschichte d. prot. Sekten im. Zeitalt. d. Ref.* (1848). Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theology*, i. 125.

the visible kingdom of Christ, which was to be erected on the ruins of Church and State. In some cases they held that temporal rule belongs to the saints alone, and carried out their fanatical theory by seizing on the city of Münster and dispossessing the magistrates. Sometimes their conduct was marked by an ascetic morality, and sometimes by licentious maxims and practices — opposite phenomena which frequently coexist in sects of this nature. They appear to have generally held a peculiar notion about the Incarnation; that the body of Christ is not formed from that of the Virgin, is different from the flesh and blood of other men, and was deified at the Ascension. Such a doctrine was held by Jean Boucher, who was put to death in England, after being examined by Cranmer. Such was the opinion also of the mystic, Caspar Schwenkfeld, a German nobleman of pious and zealous character, a leader of one of the most worthy of the Anabaptist sects, who died not far from 1561. It was in Holland that the Anabaptists were most numerous. Many of them were guilty of extravagances which afforded a fair pretext, though no just apology, for treating them with extreme severity. After the disturbances connected with the seizure of Münster, the more sober class of Anabaptists found a leader in the person of Menno, who traveled from place to place and organized them into churches. They were a simple and honest people, aiming to shape their lives according to the precepts of the Bible, discarding infant baptism, the oath, and the use of arms, admitting that civil magistrates are necessary in the present condition of the world, but refusing for themselves to hold civil office. Between the followers of Münzer, who entered into the rebellion called the Peasants' war, in whom a religious enthusiasm which had been kindled partly by the Lutheran movement was mingled with the desire to deliver themselves from the oppression of the German princes — between these enthusiasts and the humble and pious Mennonites of the Netherlands, who abjured the use of force altogether, there was a very wide difference; and yet both were branches from a common stock. Both were fruits of a widely diffused religious excitement, which, in its diverse phases, retained certain common characteristics.

Very different in many of their traits, and yet curiously connected with the Anabaptists, were the Antitrinitarians of

the age of the Reformation.[1] It was in Italy, among the cultured class, in men of inquisitive and cultivated minds, that the Antitrinitarians appeared. The peculiar tone of the belles-lettres culture that followed upon the revival of learning was often congenial with these new opinions. There was a disposition to examine the foundations of religion, to call in question the traditional doctrines of the Church, and to sift the entire creed by the application of reason to its contents. The writings of Servetus doubtless had much influence in diffusing antitrinitarian opinions; but most of the conspicuous Unitarians who first appear are of Italian birth; generally exiles from their country on account of their belief. After the publication of the antitrinitarian work of Servetus, in 1531, it is said that not less than forty educated men in Vicenza and the neighborhood were united in a private association, all of whom held Unitarian opinions. The Unitarian doctrine was found in the churches of Italian refugees at Geneva and at Zurich. Blandrata, a learned physician and afterwards an influential propagator of Unitarianism in Poland and elsewhere, was their leading adherent at the former place; while at Zurich the eminent preacher, Bernardino Ochino, embraced the same theology. Gentili was put to death in Berne in 1566 for his opinions. Alciati, an associate of Blandrata at Geneva, found an asylum in Poland. But the most eminent of this class of men, and the one who gave a name to the adherents of Unitarianism, was Faustus Socinus. Born of a noble family at Siena, in 1539, and endued with uncommon talents, he devoted himself first to the study of law. He had been left an orphan, and his education had been negligently conducted. He soon manifested an interest in theology, and was guided by the letters and conversations of his uncle, Lælius Socinus, a man of an inquiring mind, versed in classical learning, who sought the society of the Reformers in various countries, and cautiously betrayed his predilection for Unitarian tenets. The persecution to which his family were exposed compelled Faustus to leave Italy. After spending three years in Lyons, he went to Zurich to take possession of the manuscripts of his deceased uncle, which, though consisting of fragmentary papers, furnished him with

[1] F. Trechsel, *Die prot. Antitrinitarier vor F. Socin.* (1839 and 1844). Fock, *Der Socinianismus* (1847).

hints and observations of much value. For twelve years he resided at the court of Francis de Medici at Florence, and enjoyed high honors and favors, but was drawn away from the study of theology to which he was strongly inclined. Leaving Florence, he spent four years in Basel, where he labored on his theological system, and diffused his opinions by conversation and by his writings. At length he resorted to Poland (1579), where the remainder of his life was spent. At first he was not received by the Unitarians into their church, because he refused to be rebaptized. His own view was that Christian baptism was intended only for converts from heathenism. But the Polish Unitarians, like their brethren in Italy and like Servetus, were opposed to the practice of infant baptism. Socinus finally succeeded in impressing his views upon the Unitarians about him, and took the post, for which his talents fitted him, of an acknowledged leader. His intellectual power and his polished manners commended him to the favor of the Polish nobles; and his influence was augmented by his marriage with a daughter of one of them. By Socinus and by the scholars who were trained in the Polish schools, of whom Crell is the most distinguished, the Unitarian system of doctrine was ably stated and defended. Lælius Socinus, from whom Faustus derived his fundamental principles, had too much general reverence for religion to be satisfied with the Deism and Atheism which were so common among cultivated Italians about him. But he first studied the Bible to find principles which he could place at the foundation of a system of jurisprudence. There was no definite center from which his religious life emanated; no crisis of religious experience. He resorted to the Scriptures as a text-book of revealed doctrine, and brought to their interpretation the rationalistic temper which was the natural result of his studies and associations. Hence his supernaturalism stood in no vital connection with his inward life, and was therefore something, as it were, apart, having no living roots within the soul.[1] It seems at first remarkable, and yet it is character-

[1] Neander, *Dogmengeschichte*, ii. 220 seq. It is interesting to observe how the type of theology, the interpretation of the Gospel, varies according as men have, or have not, a definite center of religious life, a crisis or turning-point; such, for example, as Luther had. This diversity may be seen where there is no real discrepancy in doctrine: even in the Apostolic age, between Paul and the disciples who were subject to a gradual training. It appears, in some degree, in the contrast between Zwingli and the other great Reformers, Luther and Calvin. It

istic of the Socinian tone of thought, that supernaturalism was pushed to an extreme; that the arguments of natural religion, even for the being of God, were held in light esteem, and Revelation was declared to be the source of our knowledge, even in the case of the first truths of religion. Revelation, it was held, may contain things above reason, but nothing contrary to reason; and this canon was so applied to the interpretation of the Bible, that various doctrines, especially the Trinity, were excluded on the ground of their alleged inconsistency with intuitive knowledge. The prime characteristic of the Socinian theology was the denial of the divinity and satisfaction of Christ. He is a teacher and legislator, the appointed head of a spiritual kingdom; but while his prophetic and kingly offices are held, his priestly or expiatory function is denied, or it is limited to the work of intercessory supplication. The church doctrine of original sin is materially modified. The image of God in man is said to be identical with his dominion over the lower orders of creation, and the effect of the first sin is made to be the propagation of physical mortality. The doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked is substituted for that of eternal punishment. The separation of ethics from religion, the disjunction of ethical character from Christian faith, was a characteristic tendency of the Socinian type of thinking, and a corollary of the extreme, but one-sided supernaturalism, to which we have adverted. The logical and exegetical ability of the Socinian leaders gave a wide currency to their doctrine. When persecution arose against the Unitarians of Poland, in consequence of the Catholic Reaction and the acts of the Jesuits, many fled into Holland, and came into friendly relations with the Arminians. Some also joined the churches of the Mennonites. It was the ingenious and formidable attack of Faustus Socinus upon the Anselmic theory of the Atonement, which gave rise to the treatise of Grotius, and indirectly occasioned a modification of the orthodox doctrine which has found a wide acceptance.

The difference between the Lutheran and Calvinistic creeds was not so great as to preclude efforts to unite the two parties.[1]

is still more marked in its consequences in Erasmus and in many of the learned Arminians of Holland, when compared with their opponents. In the Socinians this difference in theology, having its source in the peculiarities of religious experience, reached its climax.

[1] The *Form of Concord* (1580, Hase, p. 570) sets forth the Lutheran theology,

The chief hindrance to their success was the intolerant prejudice of strict Lutherans, especially after their triumph over the Philippists, the adherents of the milder theology of Melancthon. The abandonment of Lutheranism by several of the German states, among which was the Palatinate, and the oppression to which Lutheran preachers were sometimes subject, in consequence of the adoption of Calvinism by their rulers, embittered the opposition to a union. Earnest and long-continued efforts in this direction were made, from the early part of the seventeenth century, by the theologians of Helmstadt, of whom Calixtus was the most eminent.[1] The Huguenot Synods of France were distinguished for their liberal and friendly course in reference to negotiations with the Lutherans.

Projects for the reunion of the entire body of Protestants with the Roman Catholics met with no better success.[2] On various occasions, as at Augsburg, in 1530, on the occasion of the Diet, in the Conference at Ratisbon, and in the Augsburg Interim, the Catholics had evinced a disposition to make concessions. The Emperor Ferdinand I. recommended conciliatory measures to the Council of Trent in 1562; and, failing in his purpose, he encouraged the theologians near him, in particular George Cassander, by their writings and personal intercourse with leading Protestants, in different countries, to labor for the reconciliation of the two contending parties. The position of Erasmus that the creed should be confined to fundamental articles, and that no agreement should be required on matters of less moment, was substantially taken by most of the advocates of reunion. Cassander proposed to go back to the Scriptures, and to the Church of the first five centuries. Calixtus adopted the same principle. Irenical movements of this character are specially interesting from the part that was

in opposition to the system of Melancthon, and in contrast with Calvinism. It denies Synergism and all power in man to coöperate in his conversion; but it also denies irresistible grace, attributes the rejection of Christ to the resistance of man to the Holy Spirit, and affirms the universality of the offers of the Gospel. Everything like Reprobation is excluded. This logically amounts to conditional predestination, which was really the Lutheran doctrine in the 17th century. This was the first point of difference with the Calvinists. The other points were the Lutheran "Consubstantiation," with which were connected the communication of divine attributes to the human nature of Jesus and the ubiquity of his body; together with the use of pictures and other minor peculiarities of the ritual.

[1] For an account of these successive efforts, see Hering, *Gsch. d. kirchl. Unionsversuche seit d. Ref.* (2 vols.), 1836. Niedner, pp. 787, 819 seq. Gieseler, IV. iii. c. I. i.

[2] Gieseler, IV. i. 2, iii. §§ 51, 52.

taken in them by two of the ablest men in the Protestant body, Grotius and Leibnitz. The latitudinarian tendency of Erasmus, and the conciliatory spirit and opinions of Melancthon once more found strong representatives. The persecution which Grotius suffered at the hands of his Protestant brethren, the Calvinists of Holland; his observation of the rigid attachment of the Protestant sects to minor peculiarities of doctrine and their bitter theological strife among themselves; his sorrow at the distracted condition of Europe in the early part of the seventeenth century, and at the calamities resulting from the wars of religion, inclined him to set a high value upon the restoration of ecclesiastical unity. His intercourse with moderate and enlightened Catholics in France confirmed this disposition. The differences among Christians appeared to him small in comparison with the points on which they were united. The tendencies of thought peculiar to him as a statesman, a scholar, and a theologian conspired to make him an advocate of compromise and union among ecclesiastical parties. It is not surprising that now he was charged with Socinianism, and now accused of being a Roman Catholic. He employed his vast erudition in the endeavor to soften Protestant antipathies to the Catholic Church and its doctrines. He wrote a treatise to prove that the Pope was called Antichrist through a misinterpretation of the Apocalypse.[1] In this and in other publications, he assumed the position of an apologist for the Catholic theology.[2] In his idealized interpretation he finds it possible even to accept transubstantiation; he does not consider the use of images in worship absolutely unlawful, although he regrets the abuses connected with it;[3] he thinks that the invo-

[1] *Grotii Opera* (Basel, 1732), iv. 457 seq.

[2] *Votum pro Pace eccl. contra examen A. Riveti, Ibid.*, p. 653, *Via ad Pacem eccl., Ibid.*, p. 535, etc.

[3] He denies the universal validity of the Decalogue under the new dispensation. He appeals to the commandment respecting the Sabbath, which Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Zwingli, and the other Reformers, united in denying to be so far obligatory that the observance of one day in seven is, on the ground of it, required of Christians. Calvin, *Institutes*, ii. 8, 29, 34. Luther, *Catechismus major*, in Hase, *Libri Symbolici*, p. 424. Melancthon, *Loci Communes* (Erlangen, 1828), pp. 123, 124. Zwingli thinks it better to mow, cut, hew, or to do other necessary work which the season demands, after divine worship, than to be idle; "for the believer is above the Sabbath." *Werke*, i. 317. Such work is recommended in the acts of the Synod of Homberg, in Hesse, on the same grounds. Hassenkamp, *Leben F. Lamberts*, p. 42. The Puritans asserted the perpetual validity of the fourth commandment, only that the day is changed by divine authority. On the history of the observance of Sunday, see Hesse, *Bampton Lectures* (1860). Hallam, *Const. Hist.*, ch. vii.

cation of saints and prayers for the dead are not inadmissible; and finds great advantages in episcopal government and in the primacy of the Pope. Even the interference of the Popes with the election of Emperors has a ground in the fact that the Popes may be considered the representatives of the Roman people. Grotius gives a place to tradition in the exegesis of Scripture. His real position is that the propositions on which all Christians can unite are to be ascertained by a universal council, composed of all parties, and that the conclusions of such a council are trustworthy. The canon of Vincent of Lerins — that what is accepted always, everywhere, and by all, is Catholic truth — is laid hold of by Grotius to serve as a basis for his scheme of comprehension and latitudinarian orthodoxy.[1]

In the latter part of the seventeenth century, Spinola, another theologian from the Court of Vienna, who had been a Franciscan General in Spain, signalized himself by a pacific undertaking similar to that of Cassander. In the course of his labors at the Hanoverian court, in behalf of syncretism, as the projected union of the diverse religious bodies was termed, he had much intercourse with the Lutheran theologian, Molanus; and a correspondence arose between Molanus, and afterwards, Leibnitz, on the one side, and Bossuet on the other.[2] Leibnitz conducted a long correspondence also, much of which relates to the same subject, with the Landgrave Ernest, of Hesse-Rheinfels, who had gone over to the Catholic Church in 1652.[3] The position taken by Leibnitz closely resembles that of Grotius. Each brought vast stores of learning, and a marvelous outlay of philosophical acuteness to the task of harmonizing conflicting dogmas. Leibnitz found the dogma of transubstantiation harder to deal with than any other article of the opposing creed; but in the alembic of his subtle criticism, discordant opinions were made to assume a likeness to one another. He lays great stress on the foundations of religion,

[1] That Grotius died, as he had lived, in the Protestant Church, is proved, if proof were necessary, by the narrative of the Lutheran clergyman who attended him in his last hours. See Bayle's Dictionary, art. "Grotius"; and Luden, *Hugo Grotius nach seinen Schicksalen u. Schriften* (Berlin, 1806), p. 338 seq.

[2] Von Rommel, *Leibnitz u. Landgraf Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels. Ein ungedruckter Briefwechsel*, etc. 2 vols. (Frankfort, 1847).

[3] On the part taken by Leibnitz, see Hering, ii. 276 seq.

and declares that the question whether the love of God is necessary for salvation, is incomparably more important than the question whether the substance of the bread remains in the Eucharist, or the question whether souls must be purified before being admitted to the vision of God. The questions in dispute between Rome and Augsburg he affirms to be of less consequence than the points in debate between the Jansenists and their opponents, within the pale of the Catholic Church.[1] He went so far as to admit the rightful primacy of the Bishop of Rome, and he professed himself to stand in an inward connection, though not in external union, with the Roman Church.[2] But in reply to pressing invitations to conform outwardly to this Church, he declined, on the ground that within its fold he could not hold in peace his philosophical opinions, with which, in reality, the Church had no right to meddle; he denied that he was a schismatic, therefore, by his own fault, and maintained the same ground in respect to Luther and the Protestants generally.[3] The Church universal, according to Leibnitz, ever holds and is authorized to teach the essentials of religion; but it is not authorized to go beyond this limit. In case it does so, and thus invades the rights of conscience, an individual, or a body of individuals, are not injured by excommunication; and, when they find themselves, without their fault, in this position, their ministry and their administration of the sacraments become valid and acceptable to God. His remedy for the divisions of Christendom was a general council, in which all parties should appear, and by which their common faith should be defined; everything else being left to the free judgment of individuals and of national churches. The point on which Leibnitz and Bossuet could not unite was the authority of the Council of Trent. Bossuet asserted that the Catholic Church could make explanations but no retractions; and that the creed of Trent could not be altered.[4] Leibnitz did not allow that the Tridentine Council is an œcumenical body; and he objected to some of its determinations: for example, to those

[1] Von Rommel, ii. 367. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 19. [3] *Ibid.*, ii. 365.

[4] It is interesting to notice that Dr. Pusey's argument for union, *An Eirenicon*, etc. (1866), was met by Archbishop Manning with the same demand for the acknowledgment of the Tridentine Council. But the representations of Roman Catholic theology by men like Bossuet and Möhler must be read with the recollection that there is a stricter orthodoxy than is found in them.

relating to marriage.[1] The outbreaking of the Jansenist persecution, and the tyranny and persecuting policy of Louis XIV., dashed in pieces whatever hopes of union sanguine persons may have been led to entertain, in consequence of these conferences between Protestant and Catholic leaders.

[1] Leibnitz wrote "a theological system" about the year 1684, which purports to be from the hand of a Catholic. His design was to exhibit that moderate type of Catholicism which must be offered on the Catholic side as a basis of negotiations for reunion. In regard to his own position he says, in a letter to T. Burnet, in 1705: "On a eu la même opinion de moi [as of Grotius], lorsque j'ai expliqué en bonne part certaines opinions des docteurs de l'Église Romaine contre les accusations outrées de nos gens. Mais quand on a voulu passer plus avant et me faire accroire, que je devais donc me ranger chez eux, je leur ai bien montré que j'en étais fort éloigné." See Niedner, *Kirchengsch.*, p. 818. On the Eucharist, Leibnitz writes: "Quant à moi (puisque vous en demandez mon sentiment, Monsieur), je me tiens à la Confession d'Augsbourg, qui met une présence réelle du corps de Jésus Christ, et reconnoit quelque chose de mystérieux dans ce Sacrament." Letter to M. Pelisson (without date). *Leibnitzii Opera*, ed. Dutens, i. 718.

CHAPTER XIV

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES AND THEIR RELATION TO THE CIVIL AUTHORITY [1]

In Scotland and Geneva the Reformation was established by public authority, as the result of a political revolution; in most other places, also, it was introduced by the free act of princes or municipalities, who acted as the organs of the popular will. In France, and wherever the government was not carried into the new movement, it was organized independently of the civil authority. In some countries — in England, for example — civil rulers took a more active and controlling part than elsewhere in shaping, as in bringing in, the new order of things. More of the previous ecclesiastical system was retained in some of the regions where Protestantism prevailed than in others. In short, the circumstances under which the revolution was effected, as well as the varied character of the communities in which it took place, had an important effect on the form of the new institutions.

The Reformers generally agreed in discarding the hierarchical idea, and in holding that the body of the Church is the original repository of ecclesiastical authority. It was government by the laity, in distinction from government by a priestly class. This fundamental principle was adhered to, and nowhere more than in England, where the fabric of the old polity was least altered. The Reformers generally held, also, that Church and

[1] Upon the topics of the Chapter, the principal Catholic manual is Walter, *Kirchenrecht* (13th ed., 1861); the principal Protestant work of a like character is Richter, *Lehrbuch d. kath u. prot. Kirchenrechts*, Leipzig, 1866. See also G. J. Planck, *Gsch. d. Enstehung u. Ausbildung d. christl. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung*, 1803 seq., 5 vols.; Richter, *Gsch. d. evang. Kirchenverfassung in Deutschl.*, 1851; Lechler, *Gsch. d. Presbyterial-Verfassung*, 1854. There are valuable articles by Sehling on *Konsistorien*, *Kollegialismus*, and *Episkopalsystem* in Hauck, *Realencyklopädie*, v. 425; x. 642, 752 seqq.; and by Müller on *Presbyterialverfassung*, *Ibid.*, xvi. 9 seq. See also Rotteck u. Welcker, *Staats Lexikon*, art. *Kirche*, *Kirchenverfassung*. A concise discussion of the possible and actual relations of Church and State is given by Bluntschli, *Staatsrecht*, ii. 250. See also Von Mohl, *Staatsrecht, Völkerrecht und Politik*, ii. 171, and Laurent, *L'Église et L'État* (1860).

State are so far distinct that neither is subject to the absolute control of the other, or can merge in the other its own existence. They opposed, on the one hand, enthusiasts and fanatics, who clamored for the subordination or surrender of secular rule to "the saints," and thus for the establishment of a theocracy. They opposed, on the other hand, an absorption of ecclesiastical power in the State, such as marked the Roman Empire under heathenism, and the Greek Empire in Christian ages.

The Lutheran Reformers professed principles upon the government of the Church and upon its relation to the civil authority, which they considered it impracticable to realize. Luther declared that all power resides in the congregation or body of believers — the Church collective. In their hands are the keys, or the right to exercise Church discipline, the sacraments, and all the powers of government. The clergy are commissioned by the people to perform offices which belong to all in common, but which all cannot discharge. They are therefore committed by the voice of the community to such as are qualified to fulfill them. The sacrament of ordination is nothing but the rite whereby persons are put into the ministry; but they are constituted an order of priests. The churches have the power to elect and ordain their ministers, for it is the churches to whom the command is addressed to preach the Gospel. The Church is endued with the right to govern itself; the right of excommunication belongs not to a body of ecclesiastics, but to the congregation and its chosen pastors.[1]

But these abstract doctrines Luther and his associates thought themselves prevented by circumstances from carrying into practice. They were led, also, by the situation in which they were placed, to modify, in important particulars, these theoretical statements, especially on the point of the relations of the civil authority to the Church. The Germans, Luther said, were too rough, wild, and turbulent, and too unpracticed in self-government to take ecclesiastical power, in this way, into their hands at once, without producing infinite disorders and confusion. The princes must take the lead in ecclesiastical arrangements, and the people must conform to their wholesome arrangements. The authority of civil rulers in the

[1] For the passages from Luther and from the Augsburg Confession, see Gieseler, IV. i. 2. § 46.

ecclesiastical sphere was pronounced to rest partly on the old right of patrons, and on kindred prerogatives which had been enjoyed by the secular guardians of the Church, and partly on the principle that princes and magistrates, as the principal members of the Church, are entitled to be heard with respect; a doctrine quite compatible with the general theory that Church government pertains not to the clergy alone, but to the laity, to the whole congregation. It was held, moreover, that it belongs to civil rulers to maintain order, by the regulation even of the externals of worship. This indefinite function thus conceded to the State was variously interpreted; but the tendency of events was to induce the Reformers to amplify rather than abridge it. The peasants' war and the subsequent strife with the Anabaptists, in which the coercive agency of the princes was necessarily called in, were influential in this direction. There was a strong reaction against the extreme view of the enthusiasts who proposed to divest the magistrate of every kind of authority. Luther is at times positive in the assertion that the jurisdiction of the civil rulers is restricted to temporal affairs, to the protection of life and property. This is the definition of the Augsburg Confession. Yet, as special questions arise, both Luther and Melancthon attribute to the State a much larger measure of power in matters of religion than these terms would naturally suggest. Villages and cities should be compelled, they say, to have schools and preachers, just as they are compelled to construct bridges and roads. But this is not all. It would be right for the Elector to enjoin the use of the Catechism, without which the people would not learn what it is to be a Christian. They proceed farther and declare that the civil magistrate should take cognizance of offenses against the first, as well as against the second, table of the law. He is morally bound to suppress and punish blasphemy; and this function, as the Reformation made progress, was held to embrace the right and duty of abolishing the mass. Such is the teaching of Melancthon in his doctrinal treatise, the "Loci Communes," and such was the judgment of both Reformers in response to special inquiries addressed to them by princes. Luther, writing in 1531 to the Margrave, George of Brandenburg, refers him to the example of the Hebrew King, Hezekiah, who did right in breaking in pieces the brazen serpent

of Moses, although his act gave the same offense to people as the abolishing of the mass would give. The Reformers recurred to the instance of Constantine, who, in his office of protector of the Church, was disposed to quell the Arian controversy and to this end convoked the Council of Nicæa. Yet Luther, as well as Melancthon, foresaw that the Church would be liable to oppression at the hands of the State; that whereas the State, under the old system, had been stripped of its rightful powers and influence, an evil just the reverse was now likely to emerge from the intermeddling and tyranny of civil rulers. Hence, both were willing that in the Protestant organization bishops should be retained or appointed, who should have only a *jure humano* authority, but who might serve as a counterpoise to the formidable influence of the State. This feature, however, was not introduced into the Lutheran organization. The bishops generally not taking the side of reform, other provisions had to be made for the management of church affairs. The political arrangements, especially after the peace of Augsburg, which suspended the spiritual jurisdiction of Roman Catholic prelates over the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, and made the religion of each secular state dependent upon that of its ruler, had the effect to put into the hands of princes more and more control in ecclesiastical affairs.

The two principal characteristics of the Lutheran polity, as it was formed in Saxony and most Lutheran communities, were the superintendents and consistories. Superintendents were first appointed in the Church of Stralsund, and next by the Elector of Saxony, in the instructions to the Visitors who were sent, at the request of the theologians, to the Saxon churches in 1527.[1] The superintendents, in their respective districts, took the place of bishops and exercised an oversight upon the doctrine and the worship of the churches and upon the pastors. The consistories arose from the need of a competent tribunal to adjudicate upon questions relating to marriage and divorce. With the abolishing of the canon law,

[1] The "Instructions to Visitors" were drawn up by Melancthon. They included a directory for divine worship and for the instruction of the people. They established a uniform system in the government and worship of the Saxon churches. The ignorance of the people and of their teachers so impressed Luther that he was led to compose his Catechisms. The system established by the Visitation was carried out by force of law.

many of the provisions of which clashed with Protestant principles, and with the loss of the old episcopal tribunals, numerous and often perplexing questions were brought before the Lutheran pastors. Not a few of the letters of Luther himself and of his associates are in response to petitions for advice from princes and private persons respecting marriage and divorce. The unsettled views on this subject — the state of things inevitably consequent on the renunciation of the old system of ecclesiastical laws, which in many points the Reformers judged to be unscriptural and unreasonable — must be taken into account, in considering the conduct of the Wittenberg Reformers in the case of the scandalous double-marriage of the Landgrave of Hesse. But marriage was partly a secular matter, falling under the cognizance of the civil tribunals, and partly ethical and religious, and so coming within the province of the Church and clergy. Hence mixed tribunals, composed partly of clergy and partly of jurists, were constituted by the civil authority, and into the hands of these bodies, called consistories, the same name which the former episcopal courts had borne, the whole ecclesiastical administration, including the right of excommunication, was committed. The only right left to the churches in the election of pastors was that of confirming or rejecting the nomination made by the patrons.

In Brandenburg and Prussia, where the bishops were not averse to the Protestant movement, the episcopal system lingered until 1587. In Denmark it was suppressed in 1536; the Danish superintendents being appointed by the king. Sweden alone of the Lutheran countries has continued the episcopal organization.

A remarkable attempt was made in Hesse to establish a church system of a quite different character. This was made under the auspices of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, who was governed by the advice of Francis Lambert, a converted Franciscan, a native of Avignon, who had embraced Protestantism, and had resided first with Zwingli at Zurich, and then at Wittenberg. The Church constitution, to which we refer, was devised at a synod at Homberg, in 1526, and was democratic in its principles. The Gospel was to be preached in every place, and then a Church was to be organized, to consist of true believers who were willing to unite in a common subjection to the rules

of discipline. The body thus composed was to choose its own pastors, who were called bishops, and might be taken from any profession, and to exercise self-government including the administration of a strict discipline and of excommunication where it should be required. Every year each Church was to be represented by bishops and delegates in a general synod, where all complaints were to be heard and doubtful questions solved. The business of the synod was to be prepared beforehand by a committee of thirteen; and at each meeting three visitors were to be chosen to investigate the condition of each Church. The plan may be described as the Congregational system with an infusion of Presbyterian elements. "The features of it," says Ranke, "are the same as those on which the French, the Scottish, and the American Church was afterwards established; upon them, one may say, the existence, the development of North America rests. They have an immeasurable, world-historical importance. At the first experiment, they appear in a complete form: a little German synod adopted them."

Luther considered the people quite unprepared for such arrangements. He often complained of the indocile roughness and obtuseness of the rustics, who could not be brought to undertake the support of their own ministers. Before the Homberg Synod he had become convinced that Church arrangements, so much at variance with those with which the Germans had been familiar, would prove impracticable and abortive. Artificial legislation, not a historical growth, was contrary to his ideas: even Moses, he said, had set down what was customary and traditional among his people. In all such matters he held that we must proceed with slow steps. "Little and well" was the motto which he adopted. Such a mass of new laws, he wrote to the Landgrave, he could not approve of; it was a great thing to make a law, and without the Spirit of God no good could come of it. Partly from Luther's opposition and still more from the influence of the causes on which his objections were founded, the Hessian constitution was never fully set in operation.

The course of events in Germany had brought the government of the Church into the hands of the Protestant princes within their respective states. Theologians and jurists pro-

posed various theories in explanation or justification of this fact. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the "episcopal system" was advocated, according to which the civil rulers were held to have received their ecclesiastical powers from the Emperor by the Treaty of Passau and the Peace of Augsburg. Some held that these powers were provisionally bestowed, by "devolution," until the opposing churches should be reunited; others, that they were now restored to the place where they had originally and rightfully belonged. At the end of the seventeenth century, the "territorial system" was set up, in which episcopal authority — *jus episcopale* — was identified with the conceded right of the princes to reform abuses in religion — the *jus reformandi.* This system made the government of the Church, not including, however, the determination of doctrinal disputes, a part of the prince's proper function, as the ruler of the State. This theory was advanced by Thomasius, whose opinion was shared for substance by Grotius, and by Selden, the English defender of the theory which denies the autonomy of the Church, and is known under the name of Erastianism. Professed at first in the interest of toleration, the "territorial system" became the potent instrument of tyranny. Another theory, the "collegial system," was elaborated by Puffendorf and Pfaff. This made the Church originally an independent society, which devolved, by contract, episcopal authority upon the civil rulers. The oppression of the Church by the State — what the Germans call *Cæsaropapismus* — has been a prolific source of evil in Lutheran communities.

In the Reformed branch of the Protestant family there was the same theory respecting the rights of the Church to govern itself, and respecting the relation of Church and State as auxiliary to one another. The independence of the Church upon secular control was in general maintained with much more distinctness and tenacity, partly from the circumstance that several of the Calvinistic Churches — for example, the churches of France, Scotland, and the Netherlands — framed their organization as sects, with no sympathy from the civil rulers. This fact was not without its influence in stamping more republican features upon their polity. In Zurich, Zwingli saw, as Luther had seen, that the body of the people were not ripe

for self-government according to a popular method; and accordingly ecclesiastical authority was placed in the hands of the Great Council, which governed the city, and was considered to represent the ecclesiastical as well as civil community. The clergy were nominated or presented by the magistracy, the privilege being given to the people, who were convened for the purpose of objecting to the candidates. Zwingli held, also, that excommunication should be left to the Christian magistracy, as long as they did not neglect their duty in this particular. In 1525 a court composed of pastors and civilians was constituted for the decision of questions pertaining to marriage and divorce. The infliction of all punishments was relegated to the civil authority. The principle of the parity of the clergy was strictly adhered to. Œcolampadius at Basel endeavored to restore church discipline to the Church itself, but his efforts in this direction, though partially successful for a time, soon failed; and the Zurich system, in its essential characteristics, was adopted in the other Swiss Cantons.

The doctrine of Calvin with regard to the proper constitution of the Church and the connection of Church and State is set forth with his usual clearness in the "Institutes." The officers of the Church are, besides deacons, lay elders who, in conjunction with the clergy, have charge of church discipline. The equality of the clergy, or the identity of presbyters and bishops, is affirmed. The officers are to be chosen by the congregation, under the lead and presidency of the officers already existing. Calvin, in speaking of the constitution of the State, does not conceal his partiality for an aristocratic form modified by democratic elements; and this feeling, notwithstanding his view that power resides ultimately in the congregation, betrays itself in his remarks on the proper method of electing officers of the Church. The Church has no authority to use force or inflict civil punishments of any sort. Its functions are purely spiritual. On the other hand, the State has no moral right to intrude within the jurisdiction of the Church or to diminish its liberty. Nevertheless, the State is bound to coöperate with the Church, and to aid it by the efficient use of distinctly civil instrumentalities. Calvin rejects the theory that the State has cognizance only of the worldly concerns of men. It is the first and most imperative duty of the magistrate to foster religion,

and hence he is solemnly bound to punish and extirpate heresy. He says that if "the Scripture did not teach that this office (of the magistracy) extends to both tables of the law, we might learn it from heathen writers; for not one of them has treated of the office of magistrates, of legislation, and civil government, without beginning with religion and divine worship." It belongs to government to see "that idolatry, sacrileges against the name of God, blasphemies against his truth, and other offenses against religion, may not openly appear and be disseminated among the people." "Civil government is designed, as long as we live in this world, to cherish and support the external worship of God, to preserve the pure doctrine of religion, to defend the constitution of the Church," as well as to promote the temporal interests of men. This idea of the relation of government to religion prevailed among Calvinists; it is distinctly asserted in the Confession of the Westminster Assembly. Nor was it peculiar to them; it is stated by Melancthon in language similar to that employed by Calvin. It is substantially the view which had been held in the Catholic Church. It has been said of Calvin with truth, that "he labored to produce in men a deeper reverence for religious acts and persons, to make them conscious of the mystic union that subsists among all true believers, and especially to invest the doctrine of the visible Church with new significance, on the ground that it is instituted not as any mere conventional establishment, but for the training and maturing of human souls in faith and holiness." He fought a battle in defense of the prerogative of the Church to excommunicate offending members, and to deny the Eucharist to the unworthy; and he vindicated this right against the interference of the civil authority. He first established the eldership in full vigor, committing the regulation of doctrine and discipline to a body of clerical and lay pastors, there being twice as many laymen as ministers on the board. Geneva being so small a territory, the synodal constitution could not be developed as it was in other Calvinistic churches. The powers that were attributed to the Church by Calvin's theory tended to give the entire system of government at Geneva the character of a theocracy; but this tendency was modified in its effect by the agency given to the Councils in the selection of church officers, and by other features in which there was a

departure from the strict principle of independence and self-government on the part of the Church.

The Presbyterian constitution was adopted, with special varieties of form, in the Protestant churches of Scotland, France, and the Netherlands. In Scotland there was at first an approximation, on one point, at least, to the Lutheran system; since, in 1560, superintendents were appointed, their jurisdiction being coextensive with the ancient diocesan divisions. But this was a transient arrangement. Nowhere did the hatred of prelacy, and of everything that looked like it, become more fervent than in Scotland. The Presbyterian system was fully established, and affirmed to exist by divine right. There were two classes of elders constituted — ruling, or lay elders, and preaching elders — who together formed the Kirksession and exercised government in the Church. Vacancies in the lay part of the session were filled by the body itself, on the nomination of the pastor. The highest tribunal for the exercise of Church authority was the General Assembly or National Synod, in which the ministerial representatives were on a footing of perfect equality. In France, the churches being separately organized, were at first autonomic in their polity, the preacher with the lay elders and deacons forming the consistory or senate, the governing body. While in Geneva, the elders were chosen for life, in France they were elected only for a term of years. Vacancies were filled on the nomination of the consistory itself. In France the elders confined themselves to the exercise of government and discipline, and did not, as at Geneva, visit the houses or coöperate officially with the pastors in the cure of souls. This auxiliary service was devolved on the deacons. In 1559 the synodal constitution was introduced, by which the authority that had resided in the consistories was limited, supreme jurisdiction being placed in the National Synod, which formed the highest court, and exercised a general superintendence in matters of doctrine and discipline.[1] The Presbyterians have always manifested a jealousy of state-

[1] A serious dispute broke out in the French Church in 1571 between the advocates of a type of Congregationalism, of whom the celebrated Ramus was one, and the defenders of the established system, which lodged the powers of government in the Consistory. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew caused the subject to be forgotten. For notices of this interesting controversy, see Martin, *Hist. de France*, ix. 277, n. 2; Weber, *Darstellung d. Calvinismus*, p. 59 n.; Von Polenz, *Geschichte d. französisch. Calv.*, i. 422, 709; Schlosser, *Leben Beza*, p. 219.

control and a disposition to keep the government of the Church in its own hands. But in England, at the epoch of the Long Parliament and the Westminster Assembly, concessions had to be made, in consequence of the want of unanimity in the adoption of Presbyterian principles and the refusal of Parliament to surrender the supreme power in ecclesiastical affairs.[1]

The relation of the established Church to the State in England, where the principal control in ecclesiastical affairs was assumed by the civil authority, has been variously defined. For a while, the Byzantine theory, which conceives of the King as possessed of a sort of priestly function, as being an ecclesiastical as well as a civil person, seems to have been tacitly held. His headship over the Church and control in ecclesiastical government were justified on this hypothesis. The Erastian doctrine, according to which the Church, as such, has none of the prerogatives of government, which inhere wholly in the State, had its adherents in England, and left its influence upon the English polity. It was the theory of Hooker that the Church of any particular country, and the State there existing, are one and the same society. They are not two distinct societies which unite or coalesce in a degree; but they are one and the same social body, which, as related of temporal concerns, and all things except true religion, is the commonwealth; as related to religion, is the Church.[2] The supremacy of the King, if the

[1] The order of worship which was adopted in the different Reformed Churches was in accord with their respective ideas of doctrine and polity. Luther retained many of the ancient forms; but he gave to the sermon a place of central importance, and was careful to insist that the arrangements of the Wittenberg Service Book should not be imposed on others. We must be masters of ceremonies — not let them be masters of us — was his motto. The singing of hymns assumed a prominent place in Lutheran worship. The changes of Zwingli were much more radical. In Zurich, church singing was given up until 1598. At Basel and some other Swiss towns, however, the German Psalms were sung. The Church of Geneva followed substantially the Zurich service, but used the French versions of the Psalms, by Marot and Beza. The Genevan Service Book served as a model for various other Reformed Churches. On this whole subject, see Gieseler, IV. i. 2, § 47, where the literature is given. The Liturgy of the Anglican Church was largely drawn from the old service books. See A. J. Stephens, *The Book of Common Prayer, with Notes, Legal and Historical* (1849). W. Maske, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England* (2d ed., 1846). C. W. Shields, *The Book of Common Prayer, as amended by the West. Divines; with a Hist. and Liturgical Treatise* (1867). Procter and Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1901).

[2] *Ecclesiast. Polity*, b. viii. "We say that the care of religion being common to all societies politic, such societies as do embrace the true religion have the name of Church given unto every one of them for distinction from the rest." "When we oppose, therefore, the Church and Commonwealth in Christian society, we

government is monarchical, over the Church is the corollary of this proposition. Among the modern advocates of this hypothesis, one of the ablest is the late Dr. Thomas Arnold. In idea, the Church and State, he thinks, are identical. Their end, their *ergon*, is the same. He rejects, with all his heart, the modern theory that the design of the State is limited to the protection of body and goods. The State, in its very idea, is religious, and is bound to aim at the promotion of religion. Rejecting, also, the doctrine of apostolic succession and of a priestly order, Arnold finds in the King's supremacy an emblem and a realization of the truth that the laity have a right to govern in the Church. The more the State is pervaded by the spirit of Christianity, the more is the Church, as a separate body, superseded. The ideal towards which we are to strive is the identification of the two.[1]

The theory of Warburton proceeds upon a denial of the identity of Church and State.[2] They are in their own nature, and originally, distinct and separate societies. But this mutual independence does not of necessity continue. They may enter into an alliance with one another upon certain terms, the result of which is a connection and mutual dependence of the two. The Church enters into a relation of subordination to the State, the State making stipulations which bind it to support the Church. There is a contract with conditions to be fulfilled on either side. If the State should fail to fulfill these engagements, the Church may withdraw from the connection, and then falls back upon its original condition of independence.

Coleridge has suggested a theory somewhat diverse from that of Warburton.[3] The hypothesis of Coleridge, as far as it is peculiar, is founded on a distinction between the visible Church of Christ, as it may be found in any particular country, and the national or established Church of that country. The visible

mean by the Commonwealth that society with relation to all the public affairs thereof, only the matter of true religion excepted: by the Church, the same society with only reference unto the matter of true religion, without any affairs besides."

[1] See Arnold's *Life and Correspondence* (by Stanley), *passim;* and Arnold's *Miscellaneous Writings*. The eminent German theologian, Rothe, has advocated a similar theory, in his *Christliche Ethik*, and in his posthumous *Dogmatik*, iii. 32 seq.

[2] This and other theories are sketched in the Preface to Coleridge's *Church and State*, by H. N. Coleridge. Coleridge's *Works* (ed. Shedd), vol. vi.

[3] *Works*, vol. vi.

Church is a kingdom not of this world; it manages its own affairs, appoints and supports its own ministers. The State is competent neither to appoint nor to displace these ministers, nor is it responsible for their maintenance. The national Church, on the contrary, is a public and visible community, having ministers whom the nation, through the agency of a constitution, has created trustees of a reserved national fund, upon fixed terms, and with defined duties, and whom, in the case of breach of those terms, or dereliction of those duties, the nation, through the same agency, may discharge. But the ministers of the one Church may also be the ministers of the other; the ministers of the visible Church of Christ may be, also, the ministers of the national or established Church. This is, for many reasons, expedient, and is actually the case. Thus the titles, emoluments, and political power of the clergy, belong to them, not as ministers of the Church of Christ, which is not national or local, but as an estate of the realm; as a body charged with the vast responsibility of preserving and promoting the moral culture of the people. In this capacity they may sit in Parliament, which is the great Council of the nation.

Mr. Gladstone, in his work on "Church and State," some of the doctrines of which he renounced later, does not differ materially from Coleridge.[1] His view partly depends on his conception of *jure divino* elements in Church polity. Mr. Gladstone holds that the State is a moral person, bound to act in the name of Christ and for the glory of God, and to make religion the paramount end in guiding and governing the nation. But he claims that the true Church, which has in it the apostolic succession, must be the body chosen by the nation for the performance of this high office. He admits that there may be a condition of religious opinion, where this alliance of the State with the Church is impracticable, as is the case in the United States; but in all such communities, he considers the life of the State maimed, imperfect, conventional.

Chalmers maintains that an establishment is necessary to the proper effect of Christianity upon a people.[2] The State, he thinks, is bound to select and support some one denomination, and maintain its religious teachers. In making the selection, the State must be governed, if this be practicable, by a

[1] *The State in Connection with the Church* (4th ed., 1841). [2] *Works*, vol. xvii.

consideration of the truth or error of the tenets of the various religious bodies. It must inquire, what is truth. But if religious opinion is so divided, or the circumstances are such that this cannot be made the sole criterion, some one "Protestant," "evangelical" denomination must be chosen.

Macaulay, in his review of Gladstone's book, represents the lowest, or most moderate type of opinion among the advocates of an Establishment.[1] He denies that the direct end of government is the propagation of religion. The direct end of government is the protection of life and property. This is the proper and only essential function of the State. But while pursuing this end, the State may and should, as a collateral object, have in view the moral and religious improvement of the people. Especially may public education be defended as necessary to the safety of the State. The promotion of religion is an incidental, not a direct or main business of the civil organization. In selecting its Church, or the religious instructors of the people, the State or government must be determined, not, indeed, by the mere will of a majority, not by its own views of truth exclusively; but must act in such a way as to secure the largest proportion of truth with the smallest admixture of error. Hence the religious views and prejudices that prevail in the community must always be consulted and respected.

In the English system, the filling of all high ecclesiastical offices devolves on the sovereign, the ecclesiastical bodies not being at liberty to refuse the formal concurrence which is required to fulfill the election. The two provinces of York and Canterbury have each its Convocation, composed of two houses, the first consisting of the bishops, and the second, of the rest of the clergy; and the two Convocations may combine. But since Convocation cannot assemble without authority from Parliament, and it is not possible for any ecclesiastical laws or canons to be passed without the consent of Parliament, the result has been that for centuries Convocation has had little more than a nominal existence. To this extent has synodal government vanished in the English Church, and the government of the Church been surrendered to the State.[2]

[1] Macaulay's *Essays*, vol. iv.

[2] Convocation, in 1665, surrendered the privilege of taxing the clergy, which had before pertained to it, to the House of Commons. Within the last twenty years attempts have been made to revive Convocation, and to invest it with some

A few lines will suffice for a brief sketch of changes in this branch of polity. In England, in early days, while the Church was engaged in planting Christianity by winning converts, it was left free from dictation by the civil rulers. When the conversion of princes and rulers in the nation was well advanced, civilians and ecclesiastics took part in managing religious concerns. It was a new epoch when the Norman Conquest by its increase of the secular power led to a rivalry and conflict between the two classes, with fluctuating results. More and more the kings gained influence in ecclesiastical affairs, compared with parliaments. The two Convocations, of Canterbury and York, existed before parliaments were organized. The times of Henry VIII. brought in a marked change. The Convocation of Canterbury submitted, in 1532, to the King's ordinances. It could be assembled only by his command. It could neither enact nor promulgate any canons or other ordinances without previous royal consent and the sovereign's approval after their adoption. Controversy between its two houses caused it to be prorogued in 1717 by a royal writ. From this time until 1861 Convocation usually met simultaneously with Parliament, but in this period had not license from the King to transact business. It was permitted to meet (Canterbury in 1852, York in 1856), but the power of ecclesiastical legislation was not granted to it. It could enter into discussions, often of much interest to the members.

Turning to the Catholic Church, we find, in the latter part of the sixteenth century, a singular development of doctrine on the origin and nature of civil authority. High views of Papal authority, as extending over mundane affairs, were promulgated by the Popes themselves, and by the Catholic theologians, especially those of the Jesuit order. The centralization of Europe, which gave such increased vigor to national feeling and to tem-

real function. Boswell records a vigorous expression of Dr. Johnson, on this matter, under date of August 3, 1763: "I had the misfortune before we parted to irritate him unintentionally. I mentioned to him how common it was in the world to ascribe to him very strange sayings. JOHNSON.— 'What do they make me say, sir?' BOSWELL.— 'Why, sir, an instance very strange indeed (laughing heartily as I spoke). David Hume told me you said that you would stand before a battery of cannon to restore Convocation to its full powers.' Little did I apprehend that he had actually said this; but I was soon convinced of my error; for, with a determined look, he thundered out: 'And would I not, sir? Shall the Presbyterian *Kirk* of Scotland have its General Assembly, and the Church of England be denied its Convocation?'"

poral authority, made it for the interest of the Papal See to divest that authority of a portion of its sanctity. Bellarmine adopted the figure which had been used by Thomas Aquinas to define the distinction, but close connection, of the civil and the Papal authority. The former is to the latter as the body to the soul. The two are not the same, but the one is inferior and subordinate to the other; at the same time that the body has functions of its own. Bellarmine affirmed only an indirect control on the part of the Pope over the temporal power. The Pope does not immediately legislate in temporal affairs. Yet as the guardian of religion and morals, he may interfere to prevent the passing or execution of a bad law. He may absolve subjects from their allegiance to a heretical or unworthy king. A vast and sweeping, though, in form, an indirect prerogative, in reference to the government of States, is thus attributed to him. The right to rebel against heretical sovereigns, and to dethrone them, was taught by the Jesuits, William Allen and Parsons, who were laboring to overthrow Elizabeth, and by other Catholic teachers in the time of the League, and of the assassination of Henry III. The right of rebellion, in the case supposed, was solemnly affirmed by the Sorbonne. The first defense of regicide had come from a priest, Jean Petit, who delivered a discourse in 1408, defending the murder of the Duke of Orleans by the Duke of Burgundy. It had required the strenuous exertions and repeated harangues of Gerson, at the Council of Constance, to procure from that body a condemnation of the doctrine of Petit. The attempt of the Poles to obtain from Martin V., and from the Council, a condemnation of the book of Falkenberg, which was of kindred tenor, and which aimed to stir up insurrection in Poland, entirely failed. The Jesuits were expelled from Paris in the early days of Henry IV., on the charge of inculcating the right to slay, by private hands, an heretical ruler. The old doctrine of tyrannicide assumed a new form, and found adherents among doctors of the Church. But in the theory of popular sovereignty, and of the social compact, the peculiar tendencies of Catholic theology are most apparent. This was advocated by Lainez, the second General of the Jesuit Order, by the eminent Spanish Jesuit, Mariana, and by Bellarmine. It is the doctrine that power, as far as temporal rule is concerned, originally resides, by the gift and appointment of God, in the people.

Government is a divine ordinance, but what form that government shall take, and in whom it shall be vested, it is for the people to determine. What the Protestants asserted respecting ecclesiastical government, the Jesuits declared of civil government. As the former taught that ecclesiastical power is originally deposited in the body of the Church, the latter declared that temporal power inheres, originally, in the body of the people. The political theory of the Jesuits had the advantage of placing the authority of the Pope and his tenure of office on a more solid foundation than that of the power of any particular dynasty or king. The rule of the Pope was given him directly from God, and, therefore, could neither be questioned nor wrested from him by men. The authority of the king, on the contrary, came to him mediately through the people, and might be recalled at their will. This political doctrine, moreover, furnished a sufficient defense for a popular rebellion, especially if it were undertaken with the sanction of the Pope. It is curious to observe that the radical speculations of Locke, Rousseau, and Jefferson, as to the origin of government, and the right of revolution, were anticipated by the Jesuit scholars of the sixteenth century. It is remarkable, moreover, that, in opposition to these novel dogmas, there appeared, on the Protestant side, a theory of the divine right of kings, and the related doctrine of passive obedience, a theory not known to the cultivated heathen nations of antiquity, and drawing no real sanction from Hebrew history. The extreme devotees of the principle of authority stand forth as the champions of the most liberal and even revolutionary notions in politics; the advocates of freedom and of revolt against spiritual authority are equally strenuous for slavish maxims of political obedience.

Transplanted to America, the various ecclesiastical systems were furnished with a new theater for the manifestation of their characteristic features, but underwent changes from the effect of the new circumstances in which they were placed. The followers of John Robinson, who settled Plymouth, were Independents. Their cardinal principles were first, that the local Church is clothed with complete powers of self-government, in the sense that no Synod or Council has any jurisdiction over it; and secondly, that none are to be admitted to the Lord's Supper, except on the credible profession of inward piety; that is, that

the Church should be composed of true believers only. The liberal and philosophical mind of Robinson had attained to principles which approach, though they do not reach, the modern doctrine of toleration and of the limited sphere of the State. He has sagacious observations on the inexpediency and mischievous consequences of coercion by the magistrate in matters of religion, and confutes the popular argument for it, which was founded on the example of the Hebrew kings. He shrewdly comments on the difference in the sentiment respecting toleration, which is felt by the adherents of a creed when they are in power, from that which they feel when they form an oppressed minority.[1] The colony of Plymouth was honorably distinguished from the other New England governments — with the exception of Rhode Island — by a greater liberality in the treatment of religious dissent. The settlers of Massachusetts Bay were not Separatists, like the Leyden immigrants, who had preceded them; but still the settlers of Massachusetts, finding themselves on ground of their own, and at liberty to shape their polity to suit their preferences, established the system of Congregationalism, in full agreement with the Church constitution of Plymouth. But Massachusetts set up a sort of theocratical system, in which members of churches were endued with the exclusive privilege of holding civil offices and exercising the right of suffrage; in which, moreover, the civil authority was authorized and obliged to punish heresy and schism, and to secure uniformity in worship and in the public profession of religion. The same system was established in the colony of New Haven; but in Connecticut, civil rights were not thus limited to church members. The principle of the independence of the local Church as to government, one of the two cardinal elements of the creed of the Independents, was retained in the Congregational churches of New England as far as the relation of one church to other churches is concerned. The office of other churches was limited to giving counsel. But the autonomy of the local Church was materially abridged in another direction, in the coercive power granted to the civil magistracy, and the intimate union of Church and State. Roger Williams brought forward the new doctrine as to the State, which limits the function of the magistrate to the cognizance of offenses against the

[1] *Works of Robinson* (Boston, 1851), i. 40.

second table of the law. This doctrine involves the toleration of all forms of religious belief and worship, as far as they do not directly disturb the peace of society, or impinge on the authority of the magistrate in his own proper sphere. The principle of religious liberty, which Williams asserted in Massachusetts, was incorporated in the government of the colony which he founded in Rhode Island, and is the principle to which the American systems of government have gradually conformed.[1] In this country, nothing of the nature of an establishment now exists. But with regard to the relation of the civil authority to Christianity, a distinction is to be made between the Federal Government, and the several States, especially the older States, that compose the Republic. The General Government was created artificially, for certain purposes and with a defined circle of powers. The National Constitution contains no explicit recognition of Christianity, and lends no special sanction to any form of religion. On the contrary, a general recognition of Christianity lingers in the constitutions of many of the older States, at least, and is implied in various statutes; so that Christianity must be considered, in some sense, a part of their public law.

Both the Episcopal and the Presbyterian Churches, as organized in this country, modify respectively their early formularies, so that the control of the magistracy in respect to synods and ecclesiastical affairs generally is left out; and the governing bodies in these denominations are free, of course, to exercise Church authority, independently of the State.

The Roman Catholic Church, in the United States, is consistent with its dogmas and traditions in advocating the distinction between Church and State. So far, the American system may be, and is, approved and lauded by theologians of that body. They join with American Protestants in opposing religious establishments, such as exist in other Protestant countries. They do not, however, renounce the old doctrine of the subordination of the State to the Church, and of the authority of the latter in civil matters of civil government and legislation. So

[1] In Maryland, founded by Lord Baltimore, a Roman Catholic (1632), although there was religious freedom for all "who believe in Christ," there was an establishment. Such a colony, subject to England, would have brought ruin on itself by attempting to persecute Protestants. But its professed principles were truly liberal for that age. See Bancroft, *Hist. of the United States*, i. 242, 254, Hildreth, *Hist. of the United States*, i. 348.

far from this, the right of the Roman Catholic Church to exercise this sort of control is frankly and boldly asserted.[1]

[1] See, for example, the first article in *The Catholic World* for July, 1872. The writer says: "With the means of instant intelligent communication and rapid transportation, is it not an impossibility to hope that the head of the Church may again become the acknowledged head of the re-united family of Christian nations; the arbiter and judge between princes and peoples, between government and government, the exponent of the supreme justice and the highest law, in all important questions affecting the rights, the interests, and the welfare of communities and individuals?" The right of the Church to regulate education and marriage is affirmed. "While the State has rights, she has them only in virtue and by permission of the superior authority, and that authority can only be expressed through the Church; that is, through the organic law, infallibly announced and unchangeably asserted, regardless of temporal consequences." This ideal supremacy of the Church, it is said, "it is within the power of the ballot, wielded by Catholic hands," to establish.

CHAPTER XV

THE RELATION OF PROTESTANTISM TO CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION

In order to judge rightly of the tendencies of Protestantism in relation to culture and civilization, or to compare Protestantism, in this respect, with the Church of Rome, something more is requisite than a bare enumeration of historical facts. Facts in this case can form the basis of induction, only so far as they are fairly traceable to the intrinsic character of the respective systems. It is the genius of the systems respectively, as it has revealed itself in their actual operation, which we have to investigate.

Protestantism and the Church of Rome have stood face to face now for upwards of three hundred years. We can look at the history and at the condition of the Protestant nations and of the Roman Catholic nations. The immediate impression made by a general comparison of this sort upon a candid observer is difficult to be resisted. What this impression is, may be stated in the language of two modern English historians, who at least are warped by no partisan attachment to the dogmatic system of the Protestant churches. Macaulay, while conceding that the Church of Rome conferred great benefits on society in the Middle Ages, by instructing the ignorant, by curbing the passions of tyrannical civil rulers, and by affording protection to their subjects, places in strong contrast the influence of the Church of Rome during the last three centuries, prior to 1848, when she had been struggling to perpetuate a sway which the developed intelligence of mankind had outgrown. "The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland natu-

rally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation; the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise. The French have doubtless shown an energy and an intelligence which, even when misdirected, have justly entitled them to be called a great people. But this apparent exception, when examined, will be found to confirm the rule; for in no country that is called Roman Catholic has the Roman Catholic Church during several generations possessed so little authority as in France." [1] Carlyle, in his quaint and vivid manner, thus writes of the peoples who threw off their allegiance to Rome, in contrast with those which rejected the Reformation. "Once risen into this divine white heat of temper, were it only for a season, and not again, the nation is thenceforth considerable through all its remaining history. What immensities of *dross* and cryptopoisonous matter will it not burn out of itself in that high temperature in the course of a few years! Witness Cromwell and his Puritans making England habitable, even under the Charles-Second terms, for a couple of centuries more. Nations are benefited, I believe, for ages, for being thrown once into divine white heat in this manner; and no nation that has not had such divine paroxysms at any time is apt to come to much." "Austria, Spain, Italy, France, Poland — the offer of the Reformation was made everywhere, and it is curious to see what has become of the nations that would not hear it. In all countries were some

[1] *History of England* (Harpers' ed.), i. 45.

that accepted; but in many there were not enough, and the rest, slowly or swiftly, with fatal, difficult industry, contrived to burn them out. Austria was once full of Protestants, but the hide-bound Flemish-Spanish Kaiser-element presiding over it, obstinately for two centuries, kept saying, 'No; we, with our dull, obstinate, Cimburgis under-lip, and lazy eyes, with our ponderous Austrian depth of Habituality, and indolence of Intellect, we prefer steady darkness to uncertain new Light!' and all men may see where Austria now is. Spain still more; poor Spain going about at this time making its 'pronunciamentos.'" "Italy too had its Protestants, but Italy killed them — managed to extinguish Protestantism. Italy put up with practical lies of all kinds, and, shrugging its shoulders, preferred going into Dilettantism and the Fine Arts. The Italians, instead of the sacred service of Fact and Performance, did Music, Painting, and the like, till even that has become impossible for them; and no noble nation, sunk from virtue to *virtù*, ever offered such a spectacle before." "But sharpest-cut example is France, to which we constantly return for illustration. France, with its keen intellect, saw the truth, and saw the falsity, in those Protestant times, and, with its ardor of generous impulse, was prone enough to adopt the former. France was within a hair's breadth of becoming actually Protestant; but France saw good to massacre Protestantism, and end it in the night of St. Bartholomew, 1572." "The Genius of Fact and Veracity accordingly withdrew, was staved off, got kept away for two hundred years. But the Writ of Summons had been served; Heaven's messenger could not stay away forever; no, he returned duly, with accounts run up, on compound interest, to the actual hour, in 1792; and then, at last, there had to be a 'Protestantism,' and we know of what kind that was."[1]

Exception may, perhaps, be taken to some particulars in the foregoing extract; but still the spectacle of the physical power, the industry and thrift, the intelligence, good government, and average morality of the Protestant nations, in the period considered, is in the highest degree significant and impressive.

The influence of Protestantism upon civil and religious liberty is one point of importance in the present inquiry. Since

[1] *Hist. of Frederick the Second* (Harpers' ed.), i. 202 seq.

Protestantism involves an assertion of the rights of the individual in the most momentous of all concerns, we should expect that its effect would be generally favorable to liberty. In considering this question, it is proper to glance at the political consequences of the Reformation.[1]

The first period after the beginning of the Reformation (1517–1556) is marked by the rivalry of Francis I. and Charles V. Neither espoused the Protestant cause; but their mutual enmity left it room to exist and to develop its strength. Notwithstanding the religious division, a new energy and vitality were infused into the constituent parts of the German Empire. The second period (1556–1603) is signalized by the revolt of the Netherlands. France, a kingdom divided against itself, was reduced for a time to a subordinate position. Spain and England were now the contending powers; the Protestant interest in Europe being led by Elizabeth, and the Catholic interest being marshaled under Philip II. Elizabeth herself was jealous of her prerogative and had no love for popular rights; but the Protestant party was, nevertheless, identified with the cause of liberty, and the Roman Catholic party with political absolutism. She was obliged, for her own safety, to give aid to the insurgents in the Netherlands and in Scotland. During her long reign, in England itself, under the inspiring influence of Protestantism, there was an agitation of constitutional questions, which augured well for the future. The great Protestant commercial Republic of Holland arose, as it were, out of the sea. In the third period (1603–1648) France, under Henry IV., for a while regains its natural position in Europe, but loses it by his untimely death. England, on the contrary, under the Stuarts, with their reactionary ecclesiasticism and subserviency to Spain, sacrifices in great part her political influence. It is the era of the Thirty Years' War; at first a civil war of Austria against Bohemia; then acquiring wider dimensions by the conquest of the Palatinate; and finally, upon the renewal of the contest between Spain and the Netherlands in 1621, interesting all Europe. The restored coöperation and religious sympathy of Austria and Spain involved peril not only for Protestantism, but for the balance of power in Europe, which was now an object of pursuit. France,

[1] Heeren, *Historical Treatises*, Oxford, 1836. The chronological divisions of Heeren are followed above.

resuming its position under the guidance of Richelieu, joined hands with Sweden in lending support to the German Protestants. Sweden, by the part which it took in this great war, and by the treaty which followed it, acquired a political standing which it had not before possessed. By this war, the northern powers were brought into connection with the rest of Europe, so that Europe, for the first time, formed one political system.[1] The treaty of Westphalia is the monument of this event. It established a balance of power and terms of peace between the religious parties in Germany. During the fourth period (1648–1702), Louis XIV. appears as the champion of absolutism, and William III. comes forward as the leader of Protestantism and of the cause of liberty. Under his auspices, constitutional freedom is finally established in England. Prussia, which began its political career at the Reformation, rose in importance under "the Great Elector" (1640–1688), and at length took the place of Sweden as the first of the northern powers. It was in the seventeenth century, during the reign of the Stuarts, that the English colonies in North America were planted, and the foundations were laid for the future Republic of the United States. Without the victory of constitutional liberty in England, and without the political example of Holland, the North American Republic could not have arisen. Among the political effects of the Reformation must be reckoned the upbuilding of Sweden and of Prussia. But when we are inquiring into the influence of Protestantism upon political liberty, it can be said with truth that the Reformation made the free Netherlands; the Reformation made free England, or was an essential agent in this work; the Reformation made the free Republic of America. "The greatest part of British America," says De Tocqueville, "was peopled by men who, after having shaken off the authority of the Pope, acknowledged no other religious supremacy. They brought with them into the New World a form of Christianity which I cannot better describe than by styling it a democratic and republican religion. This contributed powerfully to the establishment of a republic and a democracy in public affairs; and from the beginning, politics and religion contracted an alliance which has never been dissolved."[2] The town system and the "town spirit," in which this sagacious writer recognizes the germ of our political

[1] Heeren, p. 88.

[2] *Democracy in America*, I. ch. xvii.

institutions, stood in intimate connection with the control of the laity in Church affairs, and with the religious polity of the early colonists. It is true, as this same writer has remarked, that the Roman Catholic system is not unfriendly to democracy, in a certain sense of the term; in the sense of an equality of condition. But this equality of condition is the result of a common subjection of the high and the low to the priesthood; and it is attended, therefore, with two dangers: first, that a habit of mind will be formed, which is unfavorable to personal independence, and therefore to the maintenance of political freedom; and secondly, that the ecclesiastical rulers will be impelled to fortify their sway by an alliance with absolutism in the State.

In opposition to the claim that Protestantism is friendly to religious liberty, an appeal is sometimes made to facts. It is said that the history of Protestant States contains many instances of religious intolerance and persecution. This must be conceded. The first effect of the Reformation was to augment the power of princes. The clergy stood in an altered relation to the civil authority, and were deprived of a shield which had given them a measure of protection against its encroachments. The old idea that there should be, in a political community, substantial uniformity in the profession of religion and in worship, was at first prevalent, and has slowly been abandoned. Catholic has been persecuted by Protestant among Protestants, Lutheran has been persecuted by Calvinist, and Calvinist by Lutheran; Puritan by Churchman, and Churchman by Puritan. Penal laws against Catholics, or against the exercise of Catholic worship, have existed in most Protestant countries. Much can be said in defense of such enactments at the time of the Catholic Reaction, when Roman Catholics were banded together in Europe for the forcible destruction of the Protestant religion. At that period, the Jesuit order instigated Catholic rulers in different countries to multiplied acts of violence against their Protestant subjects. Moreover, the doctrine was preached that it is lawful for subjects to revolt against heretical sovereigns and to dethrone them. Protestant rulers might naturally apprehend danger from those who acknowledged a foreign jurisdiction, the limits of which were not defined, but which was often asserted to override the obligation of obedience to the civil authority. The expul-

sion of the Jesuits from Catholic, even more than from Protestant countries, partly on political grounds, in the last century, is not to be deemed an act of religious persecution; any more than the entire abolition of that Order by Clement XIV. in 1773. It must not be forgotten, however, that not unfrequently, in times past, penal laws against Roman Catholics or their worship have been framed on other than political grounds. The fact that they acknowledge some other authority in religion than the Bible, or that their rites are considered idolatrous, has been the real and the avowed reason for enactments of this character. Let it be observed, however, of these and other instances of religious intolerance, which stain the annals of Protestantism, that even by the concession of its adversaries, they are incongruous with its principles and with its true spirit. What is the charge commonly made against Protestants? That, while claiming liberty for themselves and a right of private judgment, they have at times proved themselves ready to deny these privileges to Catholics and to one another. In a word, they are charged with inconsistency, with infidelity to their own theory. The charge is equivalent to the admission that the genius of Protestantism is adverse to intolerance and demands liberty of conscience. If this be true, then we should expect that the force of logic, and the moral spirit inherent in the Protestant system, would eventually work out their legitimate results. This we find to be the fact. Among Protestant nations there has been a growing sense of obligation to respect conscience and to abstain from the use of coercion in matters of religious faith. How does an enlightened Protestant look upon the records of religious intolerance in the past, among professed disciples of the Reformation? He does not justify acts of this nature; he reprobates or deplores them. He acknowledges that they were wrong; that deeds of this kind, if done now, would deserve abhorrence, and that the guilt of those who were concerned in them is only mitigated by their comparative ignorance. This prevalent feeling among Protestants at the present day indicates the true genius and the ultimate operation of the system. Protestants abjure the principles on which the codes of intolerance were framed. How is it with their opponents? It is true that thousands of Roman Catholics would declare themselves opposed to these measures which the Protestant condemns. Their humane feelings would be shocked

at a proposition to revive the dungeon and the fagot as instruments for crushing dogmatic error or an obnoxious ritual. But the authorities of the Church of Rome do not profess any compunction for the employment of these instruments or coercion in past ages; nor do they repudiate the principles from which persecution arose and on which it was justified. So far from this, one of the pestilent errors of the age, which is thought worthy of special denunciation from the Chair of Peter, is the doctrine of liberty of conscience.[1] The massacre of St. Bartholomew and the fires of Smithfield will cease to be justly chargeable upon the Church of Rome when this Church authoritatively disavows and condemns the principle of coercing the conscience and of inflicting penalties upon what is judged to be religious error, which was at the bottom of these and of a long catalogue of like cruelties.

If the true tendency of Protestantism has evinced itself as friendly to religious and civil liberty, the Reformation has nevertheless not fostered an undue license and revolutionary disorder. The modern history of England and of the United States exhibits the gradual and wholesome growth of free political institutions. With comparatively little bloodshed, English liberty went through the crisis in which it won its victory, and embodied itself in the organic law. In recent times it is the Roman Catholic lands, in the Old World and in the New — France, Spain, Italy, Mexico, the South American States — which have been the theater of most frequent revolutions.

[1] In the Encyclical Letter of Pius IX. (December 8, 1864), addressed to all Roman Catholic bishops, the opinion is denounced as erroneous and most pernicious that "liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man ; and that this right ought, in every well-governed state, to be proclaimed and asserted by law." The Encyclical of Pope Gregory XVI. is quoted, in which this opinion is called an insanity — "deliramentum." It is among the errors which Pius IX. declared are to be abhorred, shunned, as the contagion of a pestilence. This figure of a contagion or a plague has always been used as a description of heresy, and lay at the foundation of the treatment of heretics; with the difference that in this case the disease was held to be guilty, and deserving of extreme penalties. The Syllabus of Pius IX., connected with the Encyclical (x. 78), condemned, in countries where the Catholic Church is the established faith, the allowance to others than Catholics to "enjoy the public exercise of their own worship." The Syllabus (x. 79) denounced as corrupting the opinion that civil liberty should be granted to every mode of worship, and that there should be freedom of speech and of the press, with regard to religion. The *Dublin Review* (Jan. 1872, p. 2) speaks of the opposition of liberal Catholics to what is called "persecution; *i.e.*, the laws enacted and enforced, for repression of heresy, during the ages of faith." The *Review* adds, "Now it is undeniable that for the existence of such laws the Church is mainly responsible."

We turn to the influence which the Reformation has exerted upon the intellect, or its relation to literature and science. Reference is frequently made by polemical writers on the Catholic side to complaints which Erasmus uttered, especially in the last twelve years of his life, respecting the diminished interest in literature, which he attributed to the deleterious agency of Protestantism. The statements of Erasmus at that time, when his feelings were embittered, are to be received with allowance. Yet it is true that there was a period when the studies in which Erasmus and the Humanists took special delight were regarded with a less lively interest, and that this may be set down as an effect of the Lutheran movement. It is the ordinary complaint of men of letters that in times of public agitation concerning the highest interests of mankind, grammar and rhetoric are neglected. Even the true interests of learning in such eras may suffer a temporary loss. In the old age of Erasmus, the minds of men were intensely absorbed in religious investigation and controversy; and, as a natural result, purely literary pursuits were for a while, in a degree harmful to them, eclipsed by other and more exciting studies.

In Spain Protestantism was trampled out and the Catholic system had unlimited sway. The golden age of Spanish literature, when the most celebrated authors — Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Calderon — flourished, dates from the middle of the sixteenth century. This may seem to speak well for the ecclesiastical system to which the Spanish people were subjected. But this, if it was the blossoming, was also the expiring era of Spanish letters. A deathlike lethargy, the inevitable result of superstition and ecclesiastical tyranny, was creeping over the nation. This decline of the Spanish intellect, and the causes which produced it, have been well described by the Historian of Spanish literature. "That generous and manly spirit," says Ticknor, "which is the breath of intellectual life to any people, was restrained and stifled. Some departments of literature, such as forensic eloquence and eloquence of the pulpit, satirical poetry, and elegant didactic prose, hardly appeared at all; others, like epic poetry, were strangely perverted and misdirected; while yet others, like the drama, the ballads, and the lighter forms of lyrical verse, seemed to grow exuberant and lawless, from the very restraints imposed on the rest; restraints which in fact

forced poetical genius into channels where it would otherwise have flowed much more scantily and with much less luxuriant results." Of the books published in this period, Ticknor adds: they "bore everywhere marks of the subjection to which the press and those who wrote for it were alike reduced. From the abject title-pages and dedications of the authors themselves, through the crowd of certificates collected from their friends to establish the orthodoxy of works that were often as little connected with religion as fairy tales, down to the colophon, supplicating pardon for any unconscious neglect of the authority of the Church, or any too free use of classical mythology, we are continually oppressed with painful proofs, not only how completely the human mind was enslaved in Spain, but how grievously it had become cramped and crippled by the chains it had so long worn."[1] These effects were not due solely to the action of the Inquisition or of the despotic civil government, but to that superstitious habit of the nation, that unique mingling of religion and chivalrous loyalty to the king, which rendered this whole system of intellectual tyranny possible. It was this perversion of natural feeling which moved even Lope de Vega and Cervantes to exult when six hundred thousand industrious and unoffending Moors were driven out of their native country.[2] The same stern censors who visited with death the least taint of heresy tolerated a drama more immoral than it had ever been before. The willing submission of the people to the yoke of the Inquisition extinguished the last remaining sparks of independence and of intellectual freedom. As we approach the conclusion of the seventeenth century, "the Inquisition and the despotism seem to be everywhere present and to have cast their blight over everything."[3]

The history of the Italian people had been of such a character that a degradation like that which befell Spain could not happen to Italy. Yet, from the middle of the sixteenth century, literature declined, and the intellectual vigor of the nation appeared to waste away.[4] The destruction of republican liberty and the dreadful calamities under which the country had suffered during the half-century which followed the invasion of Charles VIII. are partly responsible for this result. The Spanish dominion,

[1] *History of Spanish Literature*, i. 470. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 467.
[3] *Ibid.*, iii. 208. See, also, *Cambridge Modern History*, III : 544 seq.
[4] Sismondi, *Hist. des Républ. Ital.*, xvi. 217 seq. *Hist. of Lit. in Southern Europe*, I. ch. xvi.

which was extended over a great part of the peninsula, was fatal to all free and manly exertion. But the Church, stimulated by the spirit of the Catholic Reaction, contributed directly to the repression of that mental activity and power, which had made Italy the pioneer for other nations in the path of culture and learning. In this long period, extending through the seventeenth century, only one great name — that of Tasso, who published his principal work in 1581 — appears; and Tasso is not a poet of the first order. Art revived, for a time, in the school of the Caracci; but Art, too, had passed its meridian, and its glory was departing. The writers of the seventeenth century are called by the Italians the "Seicentisti," a term which carries with it an association of inferiority. In this period there abounded what the Italians aptly name dilettantism; an indication that a literature has entered into the period of decay. The zeal for classical learning had grown cold. The little regard felt even for perfection of literary form is illustrated by such a work — which was one of the principal historical productions of the time — as the Annals of Baronius.[1] Yet in two directions signs of a fresh intellectual energy appeared. A class of philosophers arose, who renounced the authority of Aristotle, and plunged into bold speculations upon the nature of the universe. This tendency was checked by the authorities of the Church. Giordano Bruno was carried to Rome and burned at the stake, in 1600. There was, however, a curiosity for physical research, which kept within sober limits, and promised the best fruits to science. But the heavy hand of the Inquisition was laid upon these attractive studies. The persecution of Galileo did not crush them; they continued for a long time to be the chief province in which the Italian mind was distinguished; but that event checked and discouraged them. Galileo, a man of genius, whose eminence as a discoverer in science had been well earned, was directed by Pope Paul V. in 1616, through Cardinal Bellarmine, to give up the doctrine of the earth's motion round the sun, to teach it no more, and to write no more on the subject.[2] At the same time, the Congregation of

[1] Ranke, *History of the Popes*, i. 496.

[2] A. Von Reumont, *Beiträge z. ital. Geschichte*, i. 303–425 (*Galilei u. Rom.*). Von Reumont was a learned Catholic scholar. See, also, *The Private Life of Galileo* (London, 1870). The prohibition of Paul V. was: "Ut opinionem, quod sol sit centrum mundi et immobilis, et terra moveatur, omnino relinquat, nec eam de cetero quovis modo teneat, doceat, aut defendat verbo aut scriptis." Von Reumont, p. 317.

the Inquisition declared this opinion to be heretical. Copernicus was a Roman Catholic and had dedicated his book to Paul III.; but orthodoxy had now grown more timid and jealous of scientific researches. For fifteen years Galileo abstained from publishing anything further on the subject; but in 1632 he put forth his Dialogues relative to the two cosmical systems of Ptolemæus and Copernicus; having previously taken the precaution to submit it to ecclesiastical censorship at Rome and at Florence. This publication, notwithstanding the former injunction laid upon him, was the occasion of his subsequent troubles. The old philosopher was obliged to repair to Rome and answer before the Tribunal of the Inquisition. Pope Urban VIII. insisted that the obnoxious opinion must be forbidden, as contrary to the Scriptures.[1] The explanations of Galileo, that he did not intend to violate the former prohibition, and that he had presented the Copernican doctrine only as an hypothesis, were of no avail. He was required to abjure this doctrine on his knees as false, and was sentenced to imprisonment during the Pope's pleasure. Although he was not shut up in a cell, but was permitted to reside with friends, and in his own villa, he was still subjected to uncomfortable and humiliating restrictions, and to the repeated exercise of an annoying surveillance. His aged limbs were not stretched upon the rack; but there was a moral torture in being forced to deny what he believed to be the truth. Of the deep distress which this inexorable demand occasioned him we have ample proof.[2] It is true that personal enmities — the hatred of Galileo's scientific enemies, the feeling of the Barberini towards the Medici — had an agency in the proceedings against Galileo, and that the Pope imagined himself to be covertly ridiculed in the condemned Dialogue; but these hostile influences would have been powerless, had not a prevailing spirit of intolerance been ready to lend itself to the persecution. Much is said, by a class of writers, of the "imprudence" of Galileo in attempting to harmonize his doctrine with Scripture, and in entering at all into the province of exegesis. But the most that he did in this way was to affirm that the Bible accommodates its language to common notions and does not aim to teach scientific

[1] Von Reumont, p. 380.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 393. Whewell entirely errs in what he says of the mood of Galileo — as if these events were not felt by him to be serious. *History of the Inductive Sciences*, i. 303 seq.

truth; and his explanations of Biblical passages were, as the Inquisition, in the Act of Condemnation, testifies, in answer to objections alleged against his theory.[1] He must not suggest a different interpretation of the Scriptural passages by which his adversaries were permitted to confute his opinion! The crime of his persecutors is not extenuated, but aggravated, if their accusation is reduced to this trivial charge of imprudence.

Of all the countries in which the Reformation failed, France was the only one in which literature was not blighted. In France, the reign of Louis XIV. is considered the Augustan age of letters. Three elements entered into the creation of this brilliant era — the monarchy, antiquity, and religion.[2] The splendor of the throne, the pride awakened by the conquests of the King and by the apparent power of France, kindled the intellect of the nation.[3] The monarch was the sun, and the train of authors were as planets moving about him and basking in his rays. Moreover, the classical tone of the Renaissance had survived in full power. Most of the literary men looked to antiquity for their models and rules of composition. With the poets and critics, the unities of the ancient drama were laws to be sacredly observed. If we look at the religious element, we see the deep traces of the Reformation in the Jansenist school, from which emanated the Provincial Letters of Pascal, pronounced by Voltaire the finest specimen of French prose in this whole period. The great figure in the religious world is Bossuet, the champion of Gallican against ultramontane Catholicism, and the author of the most liberal and the least obnoxious exposition of the Catholic creed. The comparative freedom of thought that remained in France was an essential condition of its literary activity. In the last days of Louis XIV. literature declined. As we pass beyond his reign, we enter the era in which a skeptical philosophy prevailed, and

[1] "And that, to the objections put forth to thee at various times, based on and drawn from Holy Scripture, thou didst answer, commenting upon and explaining the said Scripture after thy own fashion." *Life*, p. 300. The letter of Galileo to Castelli (*Life*, p. 74) expounds in a very sensible way his idea of the relation of the Bible to science. He gave great offense by a passage in another letter in which he said that he had heard an eminent ecclesiastic — Cardinal Baronius was the person meant — say that the Holy Ghost had designed to show us how to get to heaven, not how heaven moves. Von Reumont, p. 314. But the sentence of the Inquisition condemns the Copernican doctrine as "false and contrary to the Holy Scriptures."

[2] Villemain, *Lit. au Dix-huitième Siècle*, i. 2.

[3] Nisard, *Hist. de la Lit. Franç.*, i. ch. vii. and p. 430.

in which literature was divorced not only from the Church, but also from faith in the Christian Revelation.

In order to appreciate the influence of the Church of Rome, after the Reformation, upon science and culture, it is necessary to take into view the systematic censorship of books, which that Church established, and the literary and educational influence of the Order of Jesuits. In 1546 Charles V. obtained from the theological faculty of Louvain a catalogue of publications which the people were to be prohibited from reading; his design being to stop the progress of heresy in the Netherlands. His example was followed by Paul IV., who published, in 1559, a list of the same kind, with a denunciation of penalties against all who should disregard its rigid prohibitions. Under the auspices of the Council of Trent there was issued by the authority of Pius IV., in 1564, another Prohibitory Index, which has since been frequently published with successive enlargements. The Prohibitory Indexes proscribe authors or entire works without reservation; the Expurgatory Indexes, whether united with these or not, specify passages to be expunged or altered. The Index of 1564 contained ten stringent rules respecting forbidden books, and the inspection of printing-offices and book shops; to which, on various occasions, other regulations have been added.

The long Prohibitory Catalogue, although it comprises many of the principal works in history, general literature, and philosophy, as well as in theology and morals, which have been produced in modern times, conveys no adequate idea of the power of such a tyrannical supervision in the countries where it was carried out with rigor, to fetter the intellect and to paralyze its energies.[1] Milton introduces into the "Areopagitica," a reminiscence of his intercourse with the learned men of Italy, who "did nothing but bemoan the servile condition into which learning amongst them was brought; that this it was which had damped the glory of Italian wits; that nothing had there been written

[1] On the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* (1870) are the names of such historians as Hallam, Burnet, Hume, Gibbon, Mosheim, Sismondi, Bayle, Prideaux, Botta, Sarpi, Ranke; of such philosophical writers as Malebranche, Spinoza, Kant, Locke, Bacon, Des Cartes, Whately, Cousin; of publicists like Montesquieu and Grotius; of eminent poets, as Ariosto and Milton. The writings of the Reformers, Protestant versions of the Bible, all Protestant catechisms, creeds, publications of synodal acts, of conferences and of disputations, liturgies; also dictionaries and lexicons — like the lexicon of Stephanus — unless they have been previously purged of heretical passages, are prohibited *en masse*.

now, these many years, but flattery and fustian. There it was that I found and visited the famous Galileo grown old, a prisoner to the Inquisition, for thinking in astronomy otherwise than the Franciscan and Dominican licensers thought."[1]

Violations of the liberty of opinion and of the press are not exclusively the sins of Roman Catholics. In Protestant countries, after the Reformation, the supervision of the printing and circulation of books devolved on the State. A teasing and meddlesome censorship, and sometimes a severe penal code, were established by various governments. In England, in the reign of Elizabeth, printers and booksellers were restricted by rigorous enactments, and the importation of books was regulated by proclamations from the Council. The law inflicted penalties on the sale, or even the possession, of learned works of Catholic theology. In some cases libraries were searched, and books, obnoxious only on account of their doctrines, were seized. Whitgift caused the penal rules on this whole subject to be sharpened, and exercised vigilance in enforcing them. One of the charges against Laud at his impeachment, in 1644, was that he had suppressed the Geneva Bible and other books in which popery was attacked. But the managers of the impeachment coupled with this charge the accusation that he had permitted to be introduced and sold works in which Arminian and Roman Catholic opinions were countenanced.[2] It was not his suppression of books, but of a particular class of books, which constituted his offense. In the same year Milton dedicated to Parliament his ringing speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing, the "Areopagitica," which he fitly prefaced by lines from Euripides, beginning: —

> "This is true liberty, when freeborn men,
> Having to advise the public, may speak free,
> Which he who can, and will, deserves high praise."[3]

---

[1] It was his own visit to Galileo at Arcetri that suggested to Milton the comparison of the shield of Lucifer to

> —— "the moon, whose orb
> Through optic glass, the Tuscan artist views
> At evening from the top of Fesolé,
> Or in Valdarno, to descry new lands,
> Rivers or mountains, in her spotty globe."

[2] Neal, *History of the Purians*, ii. 515 seq.

[3] One of Milton's arguments is that "the infection, which is from books of controversy in religion," is more dangerous to the learned than to the ignorant; and he refers to the acute Arminius, who "was perverted" by reading "a nameless discourse, written at Delft." It is curious that Milton, as his treatise on

But even Milton, it may be observed here, did not carry his doctrine of liberty of conscience so far as to lead him to favor the toleration of the mass and other ceremonies of Roman Catholic worship, which, as being idolatrous, he thought should be forbidden.[1] Parliament, in the Puritan period, passed severe ordinances and laws for the restraint of printing.[2] But the Restoration renewed the extreme severity of the old enactments, and the Licensing Act placed all printing under the control of the government. Under the judges Scroggs and Jeffries, there was a cruel enforcement of the hateful provisions of this act. It was not until after the Revolution, when Parliament, in 1695, refused to renew this measure, that the censorship of the press was given up by the law of England. There might be continued persecution, through the wide extension given to the law of libel; but there was a gradual progress towards the abolition of all unjust restrictions upon the publication of printed matter. The multiplying of newspapers was a practical assertion of this liberty. Thus it appears that under Protestant institutions, although the freedom of discussion and of the press was not at once attained, although tyrannical laws were framed and executed, the tendency has still been in the direction of an emancipation of the minds of men from this as from other kinds of unjustifiable restraint. That the genius of Protestantism requires this liberty is now almost universally conceded.

From the latter part of the sixteenth century, education in Catholic countries fell very much into the hands of the Jesuits. Among the members of this society, and among the pupils who were trained by it, there is included a long list of men who are distinguished for services rendered to science and learning. But, generally speaking, it is in mathematics, physical science, and antiquarian research — departments standing in no close relation to their moral and dogmatic system — that they have won their eminence. The Jesuit Society has produced acute writers in casuistry and polemical theology, such men as Suarez

Christian Doctrine proves, himself became an Arminian, and an Arian besides. When he published *Paradise Lost*, in 1667, he had some difficulty in procuring a license; partly on account of the illustration, in the first book, of the eclipse that

——"with fear of change
Perplexes monarchs."

[1] See his Tract, *Of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration*, etc. (1673).

[2] May, *Const. History of England*, ii. 104.

and Bellarmine. But it has accomplished little in the higher walks of literature and philosophy, which require the genial atmosphere of freedom: and the effect of its training, as a rule, has not been to stimulate and fructify the mind, and to put it on the path of original activity and production.

In all Protestant lands, the universal diffusion of the Bible in the venacular tongues has proved an instrument of culture of inestimable value. Apart from its direct religious influence, the Bible has carried into the households, even of the humblest classes, a most effective means of mental stimulation and instruction. By its history, poetry, ethics, theology, it has expanded the intellect of common men, and roused them to reflection on themes of the highest moment. The scene which Burns depicts in "The Cotter's Saturday Night" suggests not only the religious power of the Bible in the homes of the poor, but also its elevating and inspiring influence within the entire sphere of mental action. The Church of Rome has never, by a general prohibition, interdicted the use of the Bible to the laity; but it has done little to promote it. On the contrary, the ten Rules relating to the censorship of books, which emanated from the Council of Trent, impose severe restrictions upon the circulation and reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular languages. "Inasmuch," they say, "as it is manifest from experience, that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it; it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the bishops or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented, and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. Booksellers, however, who shall sell, or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue, to persons not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use; and be subjected to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offense. But regulars shall neither read nor

purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors." [1] This rule fairly indicates the policy of the Church of Rome since the Tridentine Council. This policy had its origin after the movements of the laity, in Romanic countries, in the twelfth century, against ecclesiastical abuses, when the Waldenses and other sects resorted to the Bible and encouraged the reading of it. In England the opposition to Wickliffe had a similar effect in leading the authorities of the Church to discountenance the use of the Bible in the vulgar tongue. The Jansenists, Arnauld and his associates, advocated a more free reading of the Scriptures by the laity; but they were combated on this point, as on other peculiarities of their system. Even in recent times fulminations have been sent forth from the Vatican against Bible societies; and this hostility is not only directed against translations made by Protestants, but against the unrestricted circulation of any versions in the language of the people. Back of all these rules and prohibitions, however, there is another formidable hindrance in the way of the general reading of the Bible among Roman Catholic laymen. It arises from the doctrine that they are incapable of interpreting it. In the early ages of the Church, the Scriptures were rendered into the languages of the tribes to whom the Gospel was carried. The Fathers were not opposed to the reading of them by the people. Even as late as Gregory I. they recommend it. But the practice began to fall into disuse in consequence of the prevalent belief that laymen are incompetent to understand it — incapable of deciphering its meaning for themselves. Protestant teachers, on the contrary, have declared that the Bible is intelligible to plain men, and have universally inculcated upon all the obligation to read it habitually. The English version and the translation of Luther have entered into the intellectual life of the nations to which they severally belong, with an exciting and transforming energy, the wholesome effect and full extent of which it is impossible to estimate. To say nothing of a strictly religious influence, if we could subtract from the German mind the effect, regarded only from an intellectual point of view, of Luther's Bible, and do the same in the case of the authorized English version in its relation to the English-speaking race, how incalculable would be the loss!

[1] App. i. ad Concil. Trid. *De libris prohib.* Reg. iv. The rules are translated by Mendham, *The Literary Policy of the Church of Rome*, p. 63 seq.

The effect of the Reformation upon literature in England is generally understood. The age of Elizabeth, the era of Spenser and Raleigh, of Bacon and Shakespeare, was the period in which the ferment caused by the Reformation was at its height, and when Protestantism established its supremacy over the English mind. That Protestantism was a life-giving element in the atmosphere in which the eminent authors of that and of the following ages drew their inspiration, admits of no reasonable doubt. We have only to imagine that the reign of Mary and her religious system had continued through the sixteenth century, and we shall appreciate the indispensable part which Protestantism took in the creation of that great literary epoch. The great writers of the Elizabethan period have been called "men of the Renaissance, not men of the Reformation." [1] A brilliant French author has even grouped them together under the title of the "Pagan Renaissance." [2] It is quite true that they derived their materials largely from the poets and novelists of Italy; that the influence of the Italian culture is manifest in their works. From this point of view, the classification just mentioned is not so incorrect. Moreover, the English writers of this grand era were true to themselves; they are marked by a fresh vigor and genuine naturalness. At the same time, their veneration for the great truths of religion, their profound, unaffected faith, are equally conspicuous; and by this quality they are distinguished from the school of the Renaissance in southern Europe. The same French critic to whom we have referred, adverts, in another passage, to the constant influence of "the grave and grand idea" of religion, and adds: "In the greatest prose writers, Bacon, Burton, Sir Thomas Browne, Raleigh, we see the fruits of veneration, a settled belief in the obscure beyond; in short, faith and prayer. Several prayers written by Bacon are amongst the finest known; and the courtier, Raleigh, whilst writing of the fall of empires, and how the barbarous nations had destroyed this grand and magnificent Roman Empire, ended his book with the ideas and tone of a Bossuet." [3] It is not more true that Shakespeare rises above all the narrow con-

[1] Matthew Arnold, *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, p. 154.

[2] Taine, *History of English Literature*, i. 143 seq.

[3] i. 378. The passage of Raleigh is the apostrophe, beginning: "O, eloquent, just, and mightie Death!"

fines of sect, than that his dramas reveal a deep faith in a supernatural order, and are pervaded with the fundamental verities of the Christian religion. The boldness and independence of the Elizabethan writers, their fearless and earnest pursuit of truth, and their solemn sense of religion, apart from all asceticism and superstition, are among the effects of the Reformation.[1] This is equally true of them as it is of Milton and of the greatest of their successors. Nothing save the impulse which Protestantism gave to the English mind, and the intellectual ferment which was engendered by it, will account for the literary phenomena of the Elizabethan times.

The Reformation in Germany transferred literary activity from the South to the North.[2] Since that time, the literary achievements on the Catholic side have been, in comparison with those of the Protestants, insignificant. A learned Catholic scholar has stated the difficulty which he experienced in finding Catholic names worthy of note, when he undertook the task of describing the state of learning in Germany in the period after the Reformation.[3] He attributes this intellectual dearth to the methods of education adopted by the Jesuits, who obtained so extensive a control over the instruction of the young. In the seventeenth century, theological controversy and the desolating effects of war prevented Germany from emulating England in the path of science and literature. But the eighteenth century opens with the illustrious name of Leibnitz; and from that time, especially from the middle of that century, the achievements of the German mind in all branches of human knowledge have surpassed those of any other nation, ancient or modern. Germany has earned the distinction of being the land of scholars. It appears that in England, immediately after the Reformation, the cause of learning suffered in consequence of the injury done to schools by the confiscations of Henry VIII. and by the rapacity of his courtiers and those of Edward.[4] The attention given to theological disputes in the Universities tended for a while to the same result. In Germany, most of the Protestant leaders

[1] A just view of this matter is presented by Hazlitt, *Lectures on the Dramatic Lit. of the Age of Elizabeth* (lect. i.), where the influence of the Reformation is eloquently traced.

[2] Gervinus, *Gsch. d. poetisch. National-Lit.*, Th. iii. 20.

[3] Döllinger, *Vorträge*, etc. (Munich, 1872).

[4] Warton, *History of English Poetry*, i. § xxxvi.; Arnold, *Schools and Universities*, etc., p. 153.

were devoted Humanists. In the ferment excited at first by the Wittenberg Reform, there was danger that science and education would be neglected; and of this danger Melancthon was painfully sensible.[1] He made schools an object of earnest care. For his services in this direction he has worn since the honorable title of "Preceptor of Germany."

In no Protestant countries was the particular effect of the Reformation which we are now considering more striking than in Holland and in Scotland. Holland, as it emerged victorious from its struggle with Spain, became everywhere famous for the number and erudition of its scholars, and for the universal intelligence of its people. In the early part of the seventeenth century, Leyden, which owed its University to the victory which it gained over its besiegers in 1574, was the most renowned seat of learning in western Europe. Two thousand pupils resorted to it at one time, and scholars like Scaliger were drawn into the ranks of its teachers. In the valor of its inhabitants and their culture, in connection with the diminutive size of its territory, Holland resembled the Greece of ancient times. Even more conspicuous is the intellectual influence of Protestantism upon Scotland. Holland was not wanting in intellectual activity before the Reformation; but Scotland owes almost everything to the religious reform. Before, the mass of the people were ignorant and in a state of servile dependence on the nobles. The preaching of Knox struck a deep root in the heart of the Scotch commons. When the nobles faltered, or consulted expediency or selfish interest, it was found that the middling and lower orders of the people, who had embraced the Protestant doctrine, could not be managed, but were steadfast in defense of their liberty and religion.[2] The freedom of Scotland, its general intelligence, and the literary eminence which a great array of distinguished names in science and letters have given it, are the result of the Reformation. The minds of men were quickened and invigorated by the discussion of religious questions. An atmosphere was created in which the fruits of genius and learning have appeared in abundance.

[1] The anxiety of Melancthon on this subject, a few years after the Lutheran movement commenced, and the efforts in behalf of education to which he was prompted, are described by Galle, *Charakteristik Melancthons*, p. 119.

[2] This effect of the Reformation is well set forth by Mr. Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, p. 128 (The Influence of the Reformation on the Scottish Character).

The peculiar character of the Reformation is manifest in its influence on philosophy. The Scholastic theology and ethics were intertwined with the system of Aristotle. The subversion of his supremacy, as he was interpreted and as his method was employed by the Schoolmen, involved the overthrow of the whole fabric which they had constructed by his aid, and was an indispensable means to this end. This philosophical revolution was begun by the Humanists, and consummated at the Reformation. By the indirect effect of Protestantism, there arose another philosophical method, on the foundation of which the modern schools of metaphysics rest.

The path was broken for the assault upon the Scholastic Aristotle, by the pure Aristotelians, as they were called; those Italian Humanists in the first half of the sixteenth century, who set up the ideas which they professed to derive from the original text of the Stagirite, against the Scholastic interpretations of him. The rise of a school of Platonists was not without an influence in the same direction. The Reformers directly assaulted the principles of the Aristotelian ethics, as far as they were embodied in the Pelagian theology, and likewise his dialectical method as underlying the endless subtleties and bewildering casuistry of the mediæval systems. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that Luther was absolutely hostile to philosophy. His declamation against Aristotle is on the grounds just stated, and is qualified by other expressions of a different tenor.[1] Melancthon was more and more impressed with the necessity of a careful and thorough training for ministers, and of building up the study of philosophy as well as of classical literature in the German schools. Accordingly he prepared textbooks on the basis of the treatises of Aristotle, which long held their place. Among the Protestant theologians, Aristotle, in the shape in which he was now studied, regained his authority; so that when Peter Ramus attacked his logical system and endeavored to supplant it, the new scheme was considered by many, among whom was Beza, a dangerous innovation.

The ground which had been held by Aristotle could not be

[1] "I would willingly," he said, "keep Aristotle's books on logic, rhetoric, and poetics, or have them abridged, for they can be read with profit, and exercise young people in speaking and preaching well; but the comments and minute divisions had better be left off." *An den christl. Adel.* (1520). For other passages from Luther, of a like tenor, see Gieseler, I. ii. 3, § 48 n. 5.

left unoccupied. Philosophy must be reconstructed. Yet a new system would have to fight its way to acceptance; for Aristotle, notwithstanding the attacks of the Humanists and of the Reformers, still maintained his hold in the Catholic universities — in Paris, for example, and in the universities of Italy; and was defended as the prop of orthodox theology. The two renovators of philosophy are Bacon and Des Cartes. The systems of both are indirectly the product of the Reformation. Bacon is not the originator of a new method, much less of a new metaphysic; but in his vigorous assault upon the scientific procedure of the Schoolmen, which was identified with the name of Aristotle, and in his weighty appeal against the authority of tradition in physical study, and in behalf of independent investigation by the inductive process, he harmonized with the spirit and evinced the influence of Protestantism. The name of Des Cartes is more properly connected with the new method which characterizes modern, as distinguished from mediæval philosophy.[1] In the Scholastic period, philosophy was subservient to theology. Philosophy had its task set; it must assume the truth of a great body of propositions, and, as far as it was able, vindicate them on rational grounds. As a consequence, philosophy and theology were mingled together, in a way prejudicial to each. The method with which the name of Des Cartes is linked is utterly dissimilar; first, in separating philosophy, as a distinct department, from theology; secondly, in casting out all assumptions, all propositions borrowed from other sources, all authority, and in starting with the mind's own primitive intuitions, on the foundation of which, with the aid of logic, the whole superstructure is reared. The simple thesis, "I think, therefore I am," is found, it may be, in Augustine; and it may have been derived from him; but the originality of Des Cartes lies in his rejection of all extraneous and incongruous matter, and in his placing this brief but pregnant affirmation in the forefront of his system. On this foundation he seeks to construct a proof of God, of the soul's distinct existence, and of its immortality. Philosophy thus takes nothing for granted, is no longer "the handmaid" of any other branch of knowledge, but brings up

[1] Bouillier, *Hist. de la Philosophie Cartésienne* (2 vols. 1854); Baillet, *La Vie de Descartes* (2 vols. 1691): Ritter, *Gsch. d. christl. Phil.*, vii. 1 seq.

everything to be tested at its own tribunal. Who can fail to detect in this transformation in the character and position of philosophy the agency of the Reformation, preceded and supported, to be sure, by Humanism?

Des Cartes was himself a Roman Catholic and educated in a Jesuit school. He made a constant effort to avoid every sort of conflict with the Church and with the champions of orthodoxy. Prudently, for the sake of his own quiet, he made his residence in Holland and in Sweden. He carefully disavowed the intention to interfere with the things of faith; adopting, in this matter, language similar to that of Montaigne and his followers in the sixteenth, and of the free-thinkers of the eighteenth century. In their case, these professions were ironical and were made for the sake of avoiding an explicit antagonism to the Christian faith and its adherents. Des Cartes was more serious and earnest in his convictions; yet the course that he took was quite as much prompted by deference to a settled policy as by the dictates of conscience. It was characteristic of him, as soon as he heard of the condemnation of Galileo, to suppress his own work on "The World," in which he had advocated the Copernican view, and which was prepared for the press. But all the wariness and painstaking of Des Cartes did not avail. The empire of Scholasticism, of which the Aristotelian system was a main pillar, could not be so easily undermined. The Cartesian system was denounced by the Sorbonne, and in 1624 a decree of Parliament was procured against it. Its principal advocates were the gifted men of the Jansenist school. Prohibitions and denunciations of the new philosophy went forth from the Council of the King, the Archbishop of Paris, the universities, and from most of the religious orders, until near the end of the seventeenth century.[1] The Jesuits, whom Des Cartes had tried hard to conciliate, were his irreconcilable opponents. One of them, Valois, in the presence of the assembled clergy of France, denounced him and his followers as favorers of Calvin.[2] In 1663, his "Meditations," with some of his other writings, were placed on the Prohibitory Index at Rome, "donec corrigantur"; and there his name still stands, with the names of Locke, Bacon, Kant, Cousin, and other leaders in philosophic thought. The Sorbonne made a second attempt to obtain from

[1] Bouillier, i. 454. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 469.

Parliament a condemnatory decree against the Cartesian system, and were only baffled by the wit of Boileau, combined with the reasoning of Arnauld.[1] After this time, the philosophy of Des Cartes gained favor with the more free-minded scholars and authors — not excepting Bossuet — who adorned the literature of France in this period.

It would be interesting to trace the effect of the Reformation upon the development of other branches of knowledge. The advance of the science of international law in modern times is connected with the name of Grotius; and the rise of political economy with the names of Hume and of Adam Smith. The natural and physical sciences owe their unexampled progress to the freedom with which their investigations are prosecuted, and to the method of independent observation and experiment which has displaced the deductive and conjectural procedure of a former age. But there is one department with regard to which Protestantism is often charged with exerting a chilling influence. It is that of the fine arts. This imputation, however, will hardly be made respecting music and poetry. Nor, since the creation of the Gothic architecture — a genuine product of the Middle Ages and of the German mind — is there any type of building which can be attributed to the Church of Rome, as an offspring of its peculiar spirit. It is only in respect to painting and sculpture, in which the ideals of Art are embodied in visible form, that this objection can be brought against Protestantism with any plausibility. It is unquestionable that the special character of Art varies with the nature and circumstances of the peoples among whom it springs into being. It is also true that the northern races of the German stock are, on the one hand, less demonstrative, less impelled by an inward impulse to give visible expression to their conceptions, and more prone to abstract thought and quiet reflections, than the Latin peoples, especially the Italians.[2] This innate difference is not without its effect in producing in the southern races a greater satisfaction with a ritual that strikes the senses; and this same peculiarity is associated with an artistic impulse and skill. Yet these are not the exclusive possession of any single branch of the hu-

[1] Bouillier, i. 456 seq.

[2] This difference is portrayed in a spirited way by Taine. See *Art in the Netherlands*, pp. 31 seq., 64.

man family. The Teutonic race has, likewise, given evidence of its capacity for the highest achievements in art, as well as for the appreciation and enjoyment of its noblest products. Italian painting and sculpture were the creation of the Renaissance; and the Art of the Renaissance was largely pagan. With the revival of Catholicism Art declined. In the Netherlands there appeared a new and original development of Art; and in Holland, with its monotonous scenery and cloudy skies — a country in which Protestantism reigned — there arose a school of painters, among whom is found one of the most original and impressive of all artists, Rembrandt.

The most important topic connected with the present discussion remains to be considered. It is the bearing of the Reformation on religion. Religion is essential to the permanence and progress of civilization, not only as affording motives for the restraint of human passions and the counteraction of selfishness, but as indispensable to the healthful and fruitful exertion of the intellectual faculties. "When the religion of a people is destroyed," writes De Tocqueville, "doubt gets hold of the higher powers of the intellect, and half paralyzes all the others. Every man accustoms himself to have only confused and changing notions on the subjects most interesting to his fellow-creatures and himself." "Such a condition cannot but enervate the soul, relax the springs of the will, and prepare a people for servitude." "I am inclined to think that if faith be wanting in man, he must be subject; and if he be free, he must believe."[1] It is not strange that the right which Protestantism gives to the individual with regard to his religious belief, should be thought by some to put the interests of religion in peril. But this right is, in another aspect, also a duty; this freedom imposes a responsibility; and in relegating religion more to the individual, Protestantism does not call in question the validity of religious feelings and obligations. Protestantism fosters a spirit of inquiry; but a religion which, like Christianity, relies upon persuasion, and appeals to the reason and conscience, is in the long run profited by the full investigation of its claims and doctrines, whatever temporary evils may arise from the perverse or superficial application of the understanding to questions in the solution of which moral and religious feeling must bear a part.

[1] *Democracy in America*, ii. 24.

A brief historical review will show that the Reformation is not responsible for tendencies to skepticism and unbelief which have revealed themselves in modern society. These tendencies discovered themselves before Protestantism appeared. The Renaissance in Italy was skeptical in its spirit. Pomponatius expressed the opinion that Christianity, like other religions which had preceded it, had passed through the periods of youth and maturity and had arrived at the stage of obsolescence and decay. Marsilius Ficinus saw no help for religion for the time and until God should appear by some miraculous manifestation, save in the bolstering aid of philosophy and from the tenets of Platonism.[1] This infidelity sprang up in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, partly as a reaction against superstitious doctrines and practices which the Church countenanced, partly from the Epicurean lives of ecclesiastics and the worldliness which had corrupted the piety of the official guardians of religion. Independently of these negative influences, however, there had come a time when reason, conscious of itself and of its mature strength, rose up to scrutinize the traditions which it had accepted without a question, and to test the foundations on which faith had rested. Such an epoch occurs in the history of other religions. Had practical religion existed in greater power, this natural crisis and period of transition might have been safely passed, and the result would have been at once a more enlightened and a more assured faith. Protestantism, with the warm religious life which attended its rise, did actually interpose an effectual barrier to the spread of infidelity, and for the time smothered its germs. But the latent tendencies to which we have adverted reappeared, and, after the tide of religious earnestness in which the Reformation began had subsided; after practical religion was lost, in a measure, in the turmoil of theological controversy, and by the demoralizing effect of long and sanguinary wars, these tendencies had full play. Moreover, Protestantism was guilty of a degree of unfaithfulness to one of its own cardinal principles. The rigid enforcement of dogmatic conformity, in connection with punctilious tests of orthodoxy, within the several Protestant communions, was felt to be at variance with the Protestant principle of liberty. Among the adherents of the Reformation in the seventeenth century a new

[1] Neander, *Wissenschaftl. Abhandl.*, p. 219.

scholasticism arose. A new yoke was imposed, hardly less onerous than that which the Reformation had cast off. Hence there ensued a revolt, an extensive reaction, in behalf of this negative principle of opposition to human authority in religious concerns. Such a reaction, in the absence of an adequate check, was pushed to an extreme; so that the positive, or religious element of Protestantism was sacrificed. The cause of liberty of thought became identified with doubt or disbelief. Modern unbelief first took the form of Deism, which spread in Europe until it became the fashionable religion of the eighteenth century. In England, the wearisome conflict of theological parties impelled some to explore for a fundamental religion underlying these differences, for a creed which was held by all in common. This contributed to the rise of Free-thinking, or Deism, of which Lord Herbert of Cherbury was the first advocate of distinction. It found the most congenial home in France, whence it spread among other nations, which then looked to France for their opinions as well as their manners and fashions. The creed of Deism was an heirloom from Christianity. The sense of the supernatural, weakened though it was, still sustained the belief in a personal God, however he might be set a distance from men. Pantheism was a second legitimate step in the same path. It is the denial of the supernatural altogether; it merges the Creator in the creation, or rather in nature, which is considered the manifestation of an impersonal force or law. These types of unbelief affected the Catholic and Protestant nations alike. But France, Catholic France, was the principal center of skepticism in the last century. Even in the reign of Louis XIV., Mersenne, the friend of Des Cartes, said that there were fifty thousand Atheists in Paris. It was doubtless an exaggerated statement; yet the number of the neutral class, which accepted neither Catholicism nor Protestantism, was large; and this class either denied or doubted the truth of Revelation.[1] Deism, and finally Materialism and Atheism, became the creed of the philosophers and of the educated class. When the great Revolution burst forth, there was no principle of religion in the hearts of the people to chasten and direct the passions which

[1] Sainte Beuve says of the reign of Louis XIV., that it was "mined" by infidelity: "Le règne de Louis XIV. en est comme miné." *Port Royal*, iii. 237. Bayle's Dictionary appeared in 1697; and this may be considered a landmark in the development of skepticism.

had been excited to fury by a long course of misgovernment and oppression. The persecution of the Jansenists and the expulsion of the Huguenots, had deprived France of a moral force which might have saved it from unspeakable calamities. At the present day religious scepticism among the educated classes in Italy, Spain, and France is a notorious fact. History demonstrates that the principle of authority, as it is maintained by the Church of Rome, constitutes no safeguard against infidelity and irreligion. On the contrary, the attempt to exert an undue control over reason and conscience tends to awaken a spirit of rebellion, which is liable not only to reject the yoke that is sought to be imposed, but with it, also, the verities of religion. The spectacle of superstitious beliefs and customs, retained in an enlightened era, has a like effect. Neither Protestantism nor Catholicism can afford an absolute guarantee against the incoming and spread of unbelief. But as far as phenomena of this sort can be traced to Protestantism, it is to a Protestantism which is disloyal to its own principles. Experience proves that coercion is not adapted to procure conviction. No sounder wisdom, respecting the treatment of dissent, has ever been discovered than that of Gamaliel: "Refrain from these men and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught."

German Rationalism has assumed two forms, a critical and a philosophical. On the one hand, in a movement that began with the Arminian scholars of Holland, but which dates in Germany from the theologian Semler, there has appeared an activity in Biblical and historical criticism without a parallel. Inquiries of this nature, which have to do with the origin of the several books of the Bible, their date and authorship, and their true interpretation, with the history of the canon, and with the nature of Inspiration, and of the authority conferred by it, are consonant with the spirit of Protestantism, and are even required by its principles. Ecclesiastical tradition cannot be blindly accepted, but must be subjected to examination. Luther set the example of such criticism in the judgments — whatever exceptions may be justly taken to their soundness — which he passed upon canonical books, and in his comments upon various portions of Scripture; although, at the same time, his mind was imbued with the deepest reverence for the Word of God.

The investigations of German scholarship for the last century, whatever amount of error and groundless hypothesis may have been incidental to them, have added vastly to our knowledge of the Bible and of Christian antiquity. In the philosophical direction, Rationalism was at first Deistic; it adopted for its creed the three facts of God, free will, and immortality, which Kant derived from the "practical reason." In the successors of Kant, the influence of Spinoza was mingled with that of the philosopher of Königsberg. Pantheistic speculation supplanted Deism, and gave rise to a new phase in Biblical and historical criticism. Eichhorn and Paulus were succeeded by Strauss and Baur. In the field of philosophy, the school of materialism has also had its adherents. It is far from being true that German science has been uniformly allied to skepticism and unbelief. In Schleiermacher, deep religious feeling appeared in union with the highest degree of critical and philosophical acumen. He communicated an impulse to many who dissent from his opinions. Through him there has arisen a great body of scholars, who respect the claims both of science and of the Christian faith, and have undertaken, in a free and unbiased spirit, which Protestantism demands, to explore the past and to investigate the documents of the Christian faith, at the same time that they have recognized the indestructible foundations of religion, which lie in the intuitions and necessities of the soul, and in the facts of history. The origin of Rationalism, and its relation to the Reformation, have been thus described by Neander: "The first living development of Protestantism was succeeded, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, by a stagnation. The Catholic Church lay benumbed in its external ecclesiasticism; the Protestant in its one-sided engrossment in doctrinal abstractions. Since the ruling form of doctrine was stiffly held, in opposition to all free development, such as the principle of Protestantism demands, reactions of this original principle were called forth in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. This reactionary tendency, in the form of an emancipation from a dogmatic yoke, was carried, in the eighteenth century, far beyond its original aim. The reformatory movement, being negative, became revolutionary. With this there was connected a new epoch in the general progress of nations. The culture which had grown up under the rule of the Church sought to make itself independent.

Reason, striving after emancipation from the thraldom in which it had been held by the despotical power of the Church, revolted; and Christian doctrine was obliged to enter into a new conflict with this opposing element; but, inasmuch as Christian doctrine was possessed of a more powerful principle, it could successfully withstand the danger. The conflict served to purify it from the disturbing admixture of human elements, and to bring to view the harmony of everything purely human with that which is divine. Thus there arose, especially in Germany, a period, which began with Semler, of the breaking up of previous beliefs; but this *critical process* was a sifting and a preparation for a new creation, which emanated predominantly from Schleiermacher. This, also, could develop itself only in a renewed conflict with Rationalism: and in this conflict we at the present time are engaged." [1]

The multiplying of sects under Protestantism has frequently formed the matter of a grave objection to it. In the first generation of the Reformers, the hope of a restoration of ecclesiastical unity, by means of a general council, was not given up. For a considerable period, Protestants sought to reform the national churches, with the aim and expectation of preserving their integrity. The design was to abolish abuses and to reconstitute the creed, polity, and ritual, in conformity with their own ideas. But in some countries — in France, for example — they found themselves in a minority, and unable to accomplish their end. Liberty for them to exist, and mutual toleration between the two great divisions of the sundered Church, was the most that could be hoped for. But in Protestant countries, divisions arose which proved irreconcilable. Thus in England, the difference as to the form which the Reformation ought to take, separated Protestants into two opposing camps. Then other parties appeared, who were convinced of the unrighteousness or impolicy of establishments, whatever might be the ecclesiastical system which it was proposed to render national by a connection with the State. Sects have multiplied in Protestant countries in a manner which the early Reformers did not anticipate. On this subject of denominational or sectarian divisions, it may be said with truth, that disunion of this sort is better than a leaden uniformity, the effect of blind obedience

[1] *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 23, 24.

to ecclesiastical superiors, of the stagnation of religious thought, or of coercion. Disagreement in opinion is a penalty of intellectual activity, to which it is well to submit where the alternative is either of the evils just mentioned. It may also be said with truth, that within the pale of the Church of Rome there have been conflicts of parties and a wrangling of disputants, which are scarcely less conspicuous than the like phenomena on the Protestant side. The vehement and prolonged warfare of dogmatic schools and of religious orders, of Scotists and Thomists, of Jansenists and Jesuits, of Dominicans and Molinists, make the annals of Catholicism resound with the din of controversy. That these debates, often pushed to the point of angry contention, have been prejudicial to the interests of Christian piety, will not be questioned. At the same time, it must be conceded that the Protestant faith has been weakened within Protestant lands, and in the presence of Roman Catholics, and of the heathen nations, by the manifestations of a sectarian spirit, and by the very existence of so many diverse, and often antagonistic, denominations. The first great conflict between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians operated to retard the progress of the Reformation. The impression was made, especially upon timid and cautious minds, that no certainty with regard to religious truth could be attained, if the authority of the Church of Rome were discarded. As other divisions followed, and in some cases, on minor questions of doctrine, which yet were made the occasion of new ecclesiastical organizations, this argument of the adversaries of Protestantism was urged with an increased effect. The "variations of Protestants" were depicted in such a way as to inspire the feeling, that to renounce the old Church was to embark on a tempestuous sea, with no star to guide one's course. When we consider, from a historic point of view, the sectarian divisions of Protestantism, we find that they arose generally from the spirit of intolerance, and the spirit of faction; two tempers of feeling which have an identical root, since both grow out of a disposition to push to an extreme, even to the point of exclusion and separation, religious opinions which may be the property of an individual or of a class, but are not fundamental to the Christian faith. Protestants, having rejected the external criteria of a true Church, on which Roman Catholics insist, have sometimes hastily inferred a moral right on the part of any

number of Christians to found new Church associations at their pleasure. This has actually been done, with little insight into the design of the visible Church and into its nature as a counterpart of the Church invisible. Coupled with this propensity to divide and to establish new communions, there has appeared a tendency to overlook the proper function of the Church, and to stretch the jurisdiction of the several bodies thus formed over the individuals who belong to them, in matters both of opinion and practice, to an extent not warranted by the principles of Christianity. Protestantism has sometimes given rise to an ecclesiastical tyranny as unjustifiable as that which is charged upon Rome. In some cases, the rights of the individual count for little against the claims, or even the whims, of the particular religious community in which he is enrolled, and to which he pays allegiance. But within the bosom of the Protestant bodies there are constantly at work, with a growing efficiency, forces adverse to schism and separation, and in favor of the restoration of a Christian unity, which, springing out of common convictions with regard to essential truth, and animated by the spirit of charity, shall soften the antagonism of sects, and diminish, if not obliterate, their points of diversity. This irenical tendency seems prophetic of a new stage in the development of Protestantism, when freedom and union, liberty and order, shall be found compatible.[1]

[1] In the first age of the Reformation, Protestants were not in a situation to establish missions among the heathen. Apart from other circumstances, the dominion of the sea was in the hands of the Catholic powers. In the seventeenth century, for a long time, Protestants were too busy in defending their faith, in Europe, to think of enterprises abroad. But the English settlements in New England had for a part of their design the conversion of the Indians. The name of John Eliot has a high place in missionary biography. The Dutch, in the seventeenth century, did much missionary work among their settlements in the East; sometimes in a too sectarian spirit and with too great a desire to swell the number of nominal adherents. Cromwell formed a scheme for a society for the diffusion of Protestant Christianity over the globe. In the last century and in the present, Protestant missions have been prosecuted by different religious bodies with zeal and success. The Catholic counter-reformation was attended with great exertions for the propagation of the Catholic faith among the heathen. The Orders were especially prominent in this work. In South America and Mexico, in India, China, and Japan, their efforts were untiring. The record of Jesuit missions among the North American Indians presents examples of self-denying fortitude almost without a parallel. (See Parkman's admirable work, *The Jesuits in North America.*) In the East, Xavier labored with an irresistible earnestness. His career (1542–1552) was remarkable. Multitudes of the heathen consented to receive baptism at his hands. Nobili in India, Ricci in China, and other missionaries followed his example. The *Congregatio de propaganda fide* was established in 1622. But the religious Orders fell into conflict with one another. The

It is a distinctive characteristic of Protestantism, that it does not assume to be unerring in its interpretations of divine revelation, or in its understanding of Christian ethics. Much less does it pretend that its disciples are impeccable in practical conduct. This capacity of intellectual and moral progress leaves the Protestant free, while adhering to the essential principles of the Reformation, to criticise the doings of those in past times who have professed them, to modify their opinions on points where they are seen to have been erroneous, and to advance in a hopeful spirit towards a future in which religious truth shall be seen in a clearer light, and be more consistently applied in the lives of men.

The true relation of Christianity to culture, Protestantism, despite many inconsistencies and errors, has not failed to discern. Christianity was the religion of humanity in every just sense of the term. It not only abolished all national antipathies; broke down the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, which had been necessary in the planting of true religion: it obliterated, also, the line of separation between religion and the varied activities and provinces of human life. Rules gave way to principles; the letter of commandments to the spirit of a new life. The disciple was not to avoid the world, but only the evil in it. Religion was not to be something apart, but rather a leaven to permeate all things. St. Paul took up phrases of heathen poets and Stoic philosophers, and gave them a new setting. Christianity was to assimilate everything not alien to its own essence. It came not to trample on any genuine products of the human mind or expressions of human nature, in literature, art, or social life, but to purify them all and to reveal their connection with the supreme end of man's being. All this is comprised in the realization of the kingdom of God on earth. It involves the perfection of human nature on all sides. Thus

excessive accommodation of the Jesuits to heathen customs was sternly resisted by the Franciscans and Dominicans, and finally condemned at Rome. In Japan, the Jesuits rendered themselves politically obnoxious, and were driven out. The permanent results of the Roman Catholic missions since the Reformation, considering the number of their nominal converts, are not such as to inspire confidence in the methods in which they were prosecuted. Xavier describes the course he took — how, for example, he made Christians of ten thousand in a month. See H. J. Coleridge, *Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier* (1872), i. 280. On the Catholic missions, see Ranke, *History of the Popes*, ii. 503. Gieseler, IV. i. 3. iii. § 61; IV. ii. 2, c. iv.

Christianity came not to destroy, but to fulfill; not merely to carry out law to its ultimate statement, but to give full effect to every aspiration and tendency proper to man. Its law of self-denial was not a rule of asceticism, but of rational self-control.

The corruption of ancient society, spreading its infection within the Church, in connection with judaical ideas of the separateness of religion and of religious persons, produced asceticism. A new wall was erected between things sacred and secular, between priest and layman, between religion and human life. The ascetic would escape from the contamination of evil by abjuring even innocent gratifications. His remedy is to stunt and dwarf his nature. He attaches a stigma to relations and employments into which the bulk of mankind must enter. Such was the error of the Middle Ages.

Protestantism cast away this error. It was a religion of the spirit and of liberty. Luther advised monks and nuns to marry, to engage in useful employments, to get from life all reasonable pleasures, and to do good in a practical way. Religion is not to divorce itself from science, art, industry, recreation, from anything that promotes the well-being of man on earth; but religion is to leaven all with a higher consecration. This is the real creed of Protestantism. It does not hold to a Hebraic isolation of the religious element, nor to a pagan self-indulgence. It steers midway between the false extremes of license and asceticism. There are popular writers at the present day who openly contend for the absolute dominion of impulse, or for a surrender to nature, such as characterized the Greeks of old, but which brought ruin upon Greek civilization. They feel the error of asceticism so strongly as almost to loathe the Middle Ages.[1] These writers strangely overlook the place of self-denial in a world where evil has so great a sway; and they strangely forget that the antique culture, with all its beautiful products, underwent a terrible shipwreck. The problem of the reconciliation of religion and culture, and of the harmonizing of the proper claims of this life and of the life to come, is one for the solution of which Protestantism has the key.

[1] See the writings of Taine, passim.

APPENDIX I

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE[1]

1479. Union of Aragon and Castile under Ferdinand V. (the Catholic) and Isabella. (Conquest of Granada, 1492.)
1481. Establishment of the Spanish Inquisition. (Date of the first edicts.)
1483. Birth of Luther, November 10.
1484. Birth of Zwingli, January 1.
1485. Accession of Henry VII. (the House of Tudor), in England; end of the Wars of the Roses.
1491. Birth of Ignatius Loyola.
1492. Discovery of America by Columbus.
1493. Accession of Maximilian I. as Emperor.
1494. Invasion of Italy by Charles VIII. Conquest of Naples by the French. Beginning of the Wars of Italy.
1495. Naples reconquered by Ferdinand II. Diet of Worms: establishment of the Imperial Chamber.
1497. Birth of Melancthon, February 16. Vasco da Gama doubles the Cape of Good Hope and sails to India.
1498. Death of Savonarola, May 23.
1500. Birth of Charles V., February 24.
1501. Louis XII. and Ferdinand V. (the Catholic) conquer and divide the kingdom of Naples. Contest between them.
1502. The University of Wittenberg is founded.
1503. Louis XII. finally deprived of Naples. Erasmus publishes the "Manual of a Christian Soldier." Death of Pope Alexander VI.; accession of Julius II.
1504. Death of Isabella of Castile. She is succeeded by her daughter Joanna, with her husband Philip I. of Austria, Duke of Burgundy.
1505. Peace between France and Spain; the kingdom of Naples is left wholly to Spain. Luther enters a monastery at Erfurt, July 17.
1506. Death of Philip I. Joanna becomes demented. Charles I. succeeds them (in his minority). Julius I. begins St. Peter's Church. He extends the papal dominion over Perugia and Bologna. Accession of Sigismund I. in Poland.

[1] In preparing this Table, much aid has been derived from the Tables of Chronology in Alberi's edition of the *Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti* (Appendice), 1863.

1508. League of Cambray against Venice, formed by Julius II., Ferdinand V., Louis XII., and Maximilian I. Luther is made a professor at Wittenberg.

1509. Accession of Henry VIII. in England. His marriage with Catharine of Aragon, June 29. Luther is ordained a priest, May 2. Birth of Calvin, July 10.

1510. Conquest of Goa on the coast of Malabar; foundation of Portuguese power in the East. Julius II. unites with Venice to drive the French out of Italy. Luther visits Rome.

1511. Ferdinand V. and Henry VIII. join the Holy League, ostensibly for the protection of the Church.

1512. Maximilian joins the Holy League. Maximilian Sforza placed on the Ducal throne of Milan, from which the French are expelled. The Lateran Council (5th) opens, May 3.

1513. Death of Julius II., February 21. Accession of Leo X., March 11. Death of James IV. of Scotland. Accession of James V.

1514. Reuchlin's conflict with the Dominicans.

1515. Death of Louis XII.; accession of Francis I. He sets out to reconquer Milan. Battle of Marignano, September 13. Abolishment of the Pragmatic Sanction.

1516. Death of Ferdinand V., January 23. Charles of Austria becomes monarch of all Spain and its dependencies. Peace concluded between France, Spain, and Austria. Death of Ladislaus, king of Hungary and Bohemia; succeeded by Louis II. Zwingli a preacher in Einsiedeln. Erasmus publishes his New Testament. "Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum."

1517. Luther posts his Theses, October 31.

1518. Luther appears before Cajetan at Augsburg, October 7. Melancthon arrives at Wittenberg, August 25. Leo X. publishes a Bull on Indulgences, November 9. Mission of Miltitz into Saxony, December. Zwingli becomes pastor in Zurich.

1519. Death of Maximilian I., January 12. Charles, king of Spain, elected Emperor, June 28. Disputation at Leipsic, June 27. Birth of Catharine de Medici, April 13.

1520. Excommunication of Luther by Leo X., June 15. Luther burns the bull, December 10. Insurrection of the Spanish Commons; subdued the next year. Coronation of Charles V. at Aachen. Death of Selim I., and accession of Soliman II. as Sultan. Magellan begins the first voyage round the world.

1521. Another bull issued against Luther, January 3. Luther appears before the Diet of Worms, April 18. Edict of the Diet against him, May 26. His abduction to the Wartburg, April 28. League of Leo X. and Charles V. Milan is wrested from the French by Charles V. Accession of Henry VIII. to the League. Soliman II. invades Hungary and takes Belgrade, August. Death of Leo X., December 1. Conquest of Mexico by Cortez, completed August 13.

1522. Accession of Adrian VI., January 9. Disturbances by Carlstadt

at Wittenberg. Luther leaves the Wartburg. Luther's Answer to Henry VIII., July 15. Adrian's Letter to the Diet of Nuremberg, September 24. The Hundred Grievances of Germany. Capture of Rhodes by Soliman II.

1523. Gustavus Vasa is proclaimed king of Sweden, June 23. Defection of the Constable Bourbon. Death of Adrian VI., September 24. Accession of Clement VII., November 19. Disputations at Zurich, January 29, and October 26. Reformation in Livonia.

1524. Treaty of Malmoe. End of the Union of Calmar. Independence of Sweden. Albert of Brandenburg declares for the Reformation. The Landgrave of Hesse favors it. Catholic League signed at Ratisbon, July 10. Peasants' War. Quarrel of Erasmus and Ulrich von Hutten. Secret alliance of Clement VII. and Francis I. Order of Theatines is founded.

1525. Defeat and capture of Francis I. at Pavia, February 25. Frederic I. of Denmark grants liberty to Protestantism. Mass abolished at Zurich, April 11. Zwingli publishes his "Commentary on True and False Religion." Luther's marriage, June 13. Death of the Elector Frederic, May 5.

1526. Treaty of Madrid, January 14. Battle of Mohacs. Death of Louis II. Ferdinand of Austria becomes king of Bohemia and Hungary. Civil war in Hungary. League of Cognac, between Francis I., Clement VII., and other powers, against the Emperor, May 22. Recess of the Diet of Spires, August 27. The League of Torgau is formed. The Reformation begun in Denmark.

1527. Capture and sack of Rome by the imperial troops. Henry VIII. seeks a divorce from Catharine of Aragon. Diet of Westeras: establishment of the Reformation in Sweden. Visitation of the Saxon Churches.

1528. Reformation begins in Scotland. Martyrdom of Hamilton. Reformation established in Berne.

1529. Second Diet of Spires. Protest of the Lutherans. Treaty of Barcelona between the Pope and the Emperor. Peace of Cambray. Francis I. leaves Milan to the Empire. Siege of Vienna by Soliman II. Reformation established in Basel. The Marburg Conference, October 1.

1530. Coronation of Charles V. by Clement VII. at Bologna, February 22. Diet of Augsburg is opened, June 25. The Augsburg Confession. Geneva freed from the Dukes of Savoy. Death of Cardinal Wolsey, November 29.

1531. The Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, elected King of the Romans, January 5. League of Smalcald, February 17. Henry VIII. is styled by the clergy Head of the Church of England, March 22. A Diet of Spires, September 13. War of Cappel: Death of Zwingli, October 11. Peace between Zurich and the five Cantons, November 16. Death of Œcolampadius, November 23.

1532. Peace of Nuremberg. Alarm from the Turks. Death of the Elector John, August 15. He is succeeded by John Frederic. Farel preaches in Geneva.

1533. Divorce of Henry VIII., and his marriage with Anne Boleyn. Marriage of Henry of Orléans (afterwards Henry II.) with Catharine de Medici, October 28.

1534. Henry VIII. is excommunicated by Clement VII., March 23. Act of Supremacy passed, November 23. Death of Clement VII., Sept. 25; succeeded by Paul III., October 13. The placards posted at Paris. Alliance of Francis I. with the Sultan. Loyola commences the organization of the Jesuit Order at Paris. Luther's translation of the Bible is completed.

1535. Persecution of French Protestants by Francis I. He invites Melancthon to his court, June 28. Münster taken from the Anabaptists, June 24. Expedition of Charles V. to Tunis. Francisco Sforza leaves Milan to Charles V. Consequent war between Charles and Francis I. Establishment of Protestantism in Geneva.

1536. Execution of Anne Boleyn, May 19. Marriage of Henry VIII. with Jane Seymour, May 20. Invasion of Provence by the Imperialists. Their retreat. Death of Erasmus, July 12. Calvin publishes his "Institutes" at Basel. Calvin appears in Geneva, July.

1537. Birth of Edward VI. Death of Jane Seymour, October 12. Ecclesiastical Supremacy of Henry VIII. declared by the Irish parliament. Christian III. establishes the Reformation in Denmark. Paul III. appoints Commissions of Reform. The Counter-reformation.

1538. League against the Turks. Treaty of Ferdinand with John Zápolya. Catholic League formed in Germany, June 10. Calvin banished from Geneva.

1539. The Six Articles passed in England. Conferences in Germany between Catholics and Protestants: Hagenau; Worms. Reformation in the Duchy of Saxony and in Brandenburg.

1540. Marriage (the fourth) of Henry VIII. with Anna of Cleves. He is divorced, and marries Catharine Howard, August 8. Execution of Cromwell, July 29. Death of John of Zápolya. Edict of Fontainebleau. Paul III. approves of the statutes of the Jesuit Order, September 27.

1541. A Diet and Conference at Ratisbon: Contarini present. Expedition of Charles V. to Algiers. Soliman reënters Hungary. Calvin recalled to Geneva.

1542. Execution of Catharine Howard, February 13. War rekindled between Charles V. and Francis I. Death of James V. of Scotland. Regency of Mary of Guise. Xavier arrives at Goa in the East Indies. Reformation in Brunswick. Flight of Ochino from Italy. Revival of the Inquisition in Italy.

1543. Alliance of Charles V. and Henry VIII. against Francis I.

Marriage (the sixth) of Henry VIII. with Catharine Parr, July 12.

1544. Peace of Crespy renews, for substance, the stipulations of the Peace of Cambray. The Turks masters of a great part of Hungary.

1545. Opening of the Council of Trent, December 13.

1546. Union of Maurice of Saxony with Charles V. The Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse are put under the ban of the Empire. The Smalcaldic War. Assassination of Cardinal Beaton. Death of Luther, February 18. Diet of Ratisbon. Reformation of the Electoral Palatinate.

1547. Death of Henry VIII., January 28. He is succeeded by Edward VI. Death of Francis I., March 31. He is succeeded by Henry II. Battle of Mühlberg, April 24. The Pope transfers the Council from Trent to Bologna, by way of opposition to the influence of the Emperor. Truce between Ferdinand and the Turks.

1548. Diet at Augsburg. Establishment of the Interim, May 15. The Electoral dignity is transferred to Maurice. The Leipsic Interim. Marriage of Jeanne d'Albret with Anthony of Bourbon, Duke of Vendôme — the parents of Henry IV. Death of Sigismund I. of Poland. Succeeded by Sigismund Augustus (Sigismund II.). Mary Queen of Scots is taken to France, being contracted to the Dauphin.

1549. Death of Paul III., November 11. Book of Common Prayer is introduced. Revised in 1552.

1550. Julius III. is elected Pope, February 7. Martyr, Bucer, and other reformers from the Continent are received in England. Hooper made Bishop of Gloucester. Vestment controversy begins.

1551. Renewed war between France and Austria. Henry II. allies himself with the German Protestants. Maurice of Saxony takes up the cause of the Protestants. Capitulation of Magdeburg.

1552. Henry II. occupies Metz, Toul, and Verdun. Maurice obliges the Emperor to fly from Innsbruck, to liberate the Elector and the Landgrave, and to conclude the peace of Passau. The Emperor lays siege to Metz, October. Framing of the Articles (42) of the Church of England. Execution of Somerset.

1553. Death of Edward VI. Mary is proclaimed Queen of England, October 4. Death of Servetus at Geneva, October 27.

1554. Wyat's Rebellion. Restoration of Papal Supremacy in England. Marriage of Mary with Philip of Spain, July 25. Charles V. gives up Sicily and Naples to his son Philip.

1555. Diet of Augsburg. Peace of Augsburg. Ecclesiastical Reservation. Persecution of Protestants in England. Death of Ridley and Latimer, October 15. Death of Julius III. Accession of Paul IV., May 23. Charles V. resigns the Netherlands to Philip, October 25. League of Paul IV. with France, to wrest Naples from Spain.

1556. Abdication of Charles V., January 16. He gives up the empire to Ferdinand, August 27. He embarks for Spain, September 17. Renewal of war in Italy between the Pope in alliance with France and Spain. Death of Cranmer, March 21. Death of Ignatius Loyola, July 31.

1557. England declares war against France. Defeat of the French at St. Quentin, August 10. Peace between the Duke of Alva and Paul IV.

1558. Calais is taken from the English by the Duke of Guise, January 8. Marriage of Mary Stuart with the Dauphin, Francis, April 24. Defeat of the French at Gravelines, July 13. Death of Charles V. at the monastery of Yuste, September 21. Death of Mary of England, November 17. Accession of Elizabeth.

1559. Peace of Cateau-Cambresis, April 3. Death of Henry II., July 10. He is succeeded by Francis II. Margaret of Parma is made Regent of the Netherlands, with Granvelle, Bishop of Arras, for her principal minister. Return of Philip to Spain. Persecution of Protestants in Spain. *Autos da fé.* Act of Supremacy in England. Court of High Commission; Act of Uniformity. Death of Paul IV., August 18: succeeded by Pius IV. General Synod of the Huguenots in Paris. Contest between the Regent Mary and the Lords of the Congregation in Scotland. Return of John Knox.

1560. Conspiracy of Amboise, March. Edict of Romorantin. Coligny presents the Huguenot petitions at Fontainebleau. States-General convoked at Orléans. Navarre under surveillance. Arrest and trial of Condé. Death of Francis II., December 5. Accession of Charles IX. Catharine de Medici attains to power. Death of Gustavus Vasa. Succeeded by Eric XIV. Elizabeth supports the Protestants in Scotland. Treaty of Edinburgh. Protestantism established in Scotland by act of Parliament, August 25. Death of the Regent Mary, August 10.

1561. Return of Mary Stuart to Scotland. Mary's proclamation (August 25). Her first interview with Knox. Colloquy of Poissy, September.

1562. Edict of St. Germain. A measure of toleration is granted to the Huguenots. Massacre of Vassy, March 1. Civil war in France. Capture of Rouen. Death of Anthony of Navarre, on the Catholic side, November 17. Battle of Dreux, December 19. Revision of the Articles of the Church of England. Reopening of the Council at Trent.

1563. Siege of Orléans by the Catholics. Assassination of the Duke of Guise, February 18. Edict of Amboise, March 19. Close of the Council of Trent.

1564. Granvelle leaves the Netherlands. Death of Ferdinand I. Accession of Maximilian II. Death of Calvin, May 27.

1565. Conference of Bayonne. Marriage of Mary Stuart with Darnley, July 29. Cruel edicts of Philip II. against the Moors. Cruel-

ties of the Inquisition in the Netherlands. Death of Pius IV., December 9.

1566. Accession of Pius V. The Compromise of Breda. The Gueux. Iconoclasm in the Netherlands. Death of Soliman II. Murder of Rizzio, March 9. Birth of James VI. of Scotland, June 19.

1567. Alva sent to the Netherlands. The "Council of Blood." The Regent Margaret leaves the country, December 30. Renewal of war between Catholics and Huguenots. Murder of Darnley, February 10. Mary marries Bothwell, May 15. Resigns her crown to her son, with Murray as Regent, July 24.

1568. Flight of Mary into England. Conflict in the Netherlands. Egmont and Horn are beheaded, June 5. Peace of Longjumeau, March 23. Edict against the Huguenots, September 25.

1569. Renewed insurrection of the Huguenots. Battle of Jarnac; Death of Louis de Condé, March 13. Prince Henry of Navarre is recognized as head of the Huguenot party. Battle of Moncontour, October 3. Alva's scheme of taxation in the Netherlands.

1570. Excommunication of Elizabeth by Pius V., February 25. Second phase of Puritanism: Cartwright opposes Episcopacy. Third Peace of St. Germain. Four towns given up to the Huguenots, August 15. Assassination of the Regent Murray, January 23. Synod of Sendomir in Poland; union of Protestants.

1571. Battle of Lepanto, October 7; defeat of the Turks.

1572. Death of Pius V. Gregory XIII. succeeds him, May 13. Execution of the Duke of Norfolk, June 2. Union of Holland, Zealand, and Friesland, under William of Orange, May. Death of Jeanne d'Albret, June 10. Henry of Navarre marries Margaret of Valois, August 18. Massacre of St. Bartholomew, August 24. Death of Sigismund II. of Poland; end of the Jagellon dynasty: the crown made elective. Death of John Knox, November 24.

1573. "Pax Dissidentium" in Poland. Henry, Duke of Anjou, elected king of Poland, May 9. Alva leaves the Netherlands. He is succeeded by Requesens.

1574. Death of Charles IX., May 30. Accession of Henry III. Louis of Nassau is defeated and slain. Siege of Leyden.

1576. Organization of the League in France. Death of Requesens. Pacification of Ghent, November 8. Don John of Austria succeeds Requesens. Death of Maximilian II. Accession of Rudolph II. Jesuit influence in the imperial court. The Catholic reaction in Germany.

1577. Drake attacks the Spanish ships and settlements.

1578. Treaty of Elizabeth with the Netherlands, January 7. Death of Don John of Austria. He is succeeded by Alexander of Parma.

1579. Utrecht Union, January 23. The ten southern provinces submit to Alexander of Parma.

1580. William of Orange is proscribed by Philip II. Rebellion in Ireland fomented by Spain.

1581. The United Provinces renounce the authority of Spain, July 2. The protectorate of the Low Countries is given to the Duke of Anjou, brother of Henry III.
1582. Successes of Parma in the Netherlands.
1583. The Duke of Anjou returns to France.
1584. Death of the Duke of Anjou, June 10. Henry of Navarre becomes the heir of the crown. Alliance of the League with Spain. Treaty of Joinville, December 31. Assassination of William of Orange, July 10.
1585. Death of Gregory XIII., April 10. Accession of Sixtus V., April 24. He excommunicates Henry of Navarre, September 10. Surrender of Antwerp to Alexander of Parma, August 17. The United Provinces place themselves under the protection of Elizabeth. Leicester sent into the Netherlands. Drake attacks the Spanish settlements in the West Indies.
1586. War of the three Henries — Henry III., Navarre, and Guise. League between James VI. and Elizabeth.
1587. Execution of Mary Queen of Scots, February 8. Leicester returns to England. Maurice of Orange acquires the chief direction of the contest in the Netherlands. Sigismund III. of Sweden is elected king of Poland.
1588. Hostile attitude of the League towards Henry III. Barricades in Paris, May 12. Defeat of the Spanish Armada. Meeting of the States-General at Blois. Assassination of the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal his brother, by Henry III.
1589. Death of Catharine de Medici, January 5. Henry III. joins Navarre. Assassination of Henry III., August 1. Henry IV. is resisted by the League.
1590. Victory of Henry IV. at Ivry over the Duke of Mayenne, March 14. Death of Sixtus V. Succeeded by Urban VII. Parma raises the siege of Paris.
1591. Bull of Gregory XIV. against Henry IV. Death of Gregory XIV., October 15. Succeeded by Innocent IX. His death December 30. Henry IV. invests Rouen. Renewed invasion of Hungary by the Turks.
1592. Clement VIII. becomes Pope, January 30. Parma raises the siege of Rouen. Death of Parma, December 2. Presbyterianism is fully established in Scotland.
1593. Division of counsels in the League. Abjuration of Henry IV., July 25. Rout of the Turks in Hungary.
1594. Henry IV. is crowned at Chartres, February 27. He enters Paris, March 22. Maurice of Orange recovers the whole territory of the United Provinces.
1595. Henry IV. declares war against Philip II., January 17. Clement VIII. absolves Henry IV., September 17.
1596. Alliance of Henry IV. with Elizabeth. The English destroy the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Cadiz.
1598. The Edict of Nantes, April 30. The Peace of Vervins between

France and Spain, May 2. Death of Philip II., September 13. He is succeeded by Philip III.

1600. Marriage of Henry IV. with Mary de Medici. Giordano Bruno is burned at the stake, February 17.

1603. Death of Queen Elizabeth, March 24. Accession of James I.

1604. Hampton Court Conference, January 16. Letter of Majesty grants protection to the Protestants of Bohemia.

1605. The Gunpowder Plot.

1607. Donauwörth seized by the Duke of Bavaria.

1608. Protestants Union formed in Germany.

1609. Twelve years' truce established between Spain and the United Provinces.

1610. Catholic League formed in Germany under the Duke of Bavaria.

1611. The English Bible published by authority. Gustavus Adolphus becomes king of Sweden.

1612. Matthias becomes emperor.

1617. James I. imposes Episcopacy on Scotland.

1618. Revolt of the Bohemians against Ferdinand II. in defense of their religious liberties.

1619. Accession of Ferdinand II. as Emperor. Election of Ferdinand V., Elector Palatine, as king of Bohemia.

1620. The Elector Palatine stripped of his dominions. Persecution of Puritans in England. Landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, December 21. Convent of Port Royal established.

1621. Revolt of the Huguenots.

1622. Congregatio de Propaganda Fide is established: (college for missionaries founded, 1627).

1624. Richelieu becomes the minister of Louis XIII.

1625. Accession of Charles I. War with the Huguenots begins in France. Alliance of England, Holland, and Denmark, in behalf of the Elector Palatine.

1626. Death of Lord Bacon. Defeat of Mansfeld by Wallenstein at Dessau.

1627. Mecklenburg is given to Wallenstein.

1628. Surrender of Rochelle. Destruction of the political power of the Huguenots.

1629. Edict of Restitution, March. Peace of Lübeck, May.

1630. Wallenstein dismissed from his command. Intervention of Gustavus Adolphus.

1631. The capture of Magdeburg by Tilly, May. Battle of Leipsic; defeat of Tilly, August 28. Wallenstein restored to his command, April.

1632. Battle of Lutzen: death of Gustavus Adolphus, November 16.

1633. Alliance of France with Sweden and the Protestants: treaty of Heilbronn, April 23. Laud is made Archbishop of Canterbury. Galileo is forced to renounce the Copernican theory.

1634. Defeat of the Swedes at Nordlingen, September 6.

1635. The Peace of Prague, May 30. The Edict of Restitution is given up as to Saxony and Brandenburg.

1637. Accession of Ferdinand III. as Emperor.
1638. Bernard of Weimar leads the anti-imperialist forces.
1639. Death of Bernard. Richelieu's influence predominant in the war.
1640. The Long Parliament assembles in England. Accession of Frederic William, the Great Elector.
1642. War of King and Parliament in England.
1643. Accession of Louis XIV. Westminster Assembly meets. League and Covenant adopted by Parliament.
1644. Accession of Pope Innocent X.
1645. Battle of Naseby.
1648. Peace of Westphalia. Termination of the Thirty Years' War.
1649. Execution of Charles I.
1650. Death of Des Cartes.
1653. Cromwell is made Lord Protector. Condemnation of Jansenism by Innocent X.
1658. Death of Cromwell.
1660. Restoration of Charles II.
1661. The Savoy Conference. Restoration of Episcopacy in Scotland. Death of Mazarin. Persecution of the Huguenots.
1662. Ejection of the Presbyterian ministers under the Act of Uniformity.
1668. Triple alliance against Louis XIV., to compel him to make peace with Spain.
1670. Secret alliance of Charles II. and Louis XIV.
1672. William III. is elected Stadtholder.
1673. Declaration of Indulgence by Charles II.
1676. Accession of Innocent XI.
1678–9. Peace of Nimeguen.
1682. Assembly of the clergy of France: four Propositions of Gallicanism.
1685. Death of Charles II. Accession of James II. Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, October 18.
1686. Revival of the Court of High Commission by James II.
1688. William III. lands at Torbay. Flight of James II.
1691. Accession of Innocent XII.
1694. Birth of Voltaire, November 21.
1695. Peace of Ryswick, September 20. Louis XIV. acknowledges William III. as king of Great Britain and Ireland.

APPENDIX II

A LIST OF WORKS ON THE REFORMATION[1]

Works in General History relating to the Period of the Reformation

Thuanus (De Thou): Historiarum sui Temporis, libri 138 (1546–1607). First complete ed.; Orleans (Geneva), 1620 seq., 5 vols., fol. (With the appendix of Rigault, 7 vols., London, 1733, fol.) French transl. 16 vols., 4to, London (Paris), 1734.

De Thou, son of Christophe de Thou, President of the Parliament of Paris, was born in 1553, and died in 1617. He held high offices under Henry III. and Henry IV. He was a moderate Catholic, personally conversant with the men and events of his time, and an upright historian.

Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti al Senato, raccolte, annotate, ed edite da Eugenio Alberi. 15 vols. 8vo. Firenze, 1839–63.

W. Robertson: History of Charles V. Ed. by W. H. Prescott, with Supplement on the Cloister Life of the Emperor. 3 vols. 8vo. 1856.

History of the European States, published by Heeren and Ukert. 64 vols. 8vo. 1829–58.

The series includes Italy, by H. Leo; Netherlands, by Van Kampen; Denmark, by Dahlmann (to 1523); Sweden, by Geijer and Carlson (to 1680); Poland, by Roepell, etc.

Heeren: Handbuch d. Gesch. d. europäisch. Staatensystems u. seiner Colonien. 5th ed. Göttingen, 1830. Engl. Translation by Bancroft, 2 vols. 8vo. 1829; also, 2 vols., Oxford, 1834.

Von Raumer: Gesch. Europas seit d. Ende d. 15. Jahrh. Leipzig, 1832–50. 8 vols. 8vo.

Hallam: Introduction to the Lit. of Europe, in the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries. 5th ed. 3 vols. 8vo. 1855–56.

Ranke: Fürsten u. Völker v. Südeuropa im 16. u. 17. Jahrh. Bd. I. Berlin, 1827. Die röm. Päpste, ihre Kirche u. ihr Staat im. 16. u. 17. Jahrh. 3 vols. 4th ed. Berlin, 1854–57. 8vo. Translated by Sarah Austin: History of the Popes of Rome during the 16th and

[1] This catalogue comprises, of course, only a fractional part of the historical literature pertaining to the subject. Not to speak of works of a broader scope, there are, in Germany especially, numerous local histories relating to this period. In preparing the list above, care has been taken to set down the proper editions; but it is almost impossible to attain to absolute correctness in these particulars.

17th centuries. Lon. 1905. 1 vol. 4th ed. 3 vols. London, 1867. 8vo. This is one of the most correct and elegant of all English translations from the German. The work itself is of the highest value. For Ranke's other works on this period see under the different countries.

L. Häusser: Geschichte d. Zeitalters d. Reformation (1517–1648). Berlin, 1868. 8vo. Valuable, especially for the political side of the history of this period.

Duruy: Hist. des Temps Modernes. 1 vol. Paris, 1863. 12mo. One of a series of lucid and compact text-books, for use in the schools of France.

Bayle: Dictionnaire historique et critique (1st ed. 1697), 4 vols. Fol. Basel and Amsterdam, 1740. Engl. ed., 10 vols., fol., 1734–41.

Bayle, the son of a Huguenot clergyman, was born in 1647, and died in 1706. Under the influence of Jesuits, he became a Roman Catholic, but repented of this change, and became one of the pioneers of philosophical skepticism in Europe. Its great amount of interesting historical and biographical details, though requiring to be critically sifted, gives to his Dictionary a peculiar and permanent value.

T. H. Dyer: A History of Modern Europe from the Fall of Constantinople. 3d ed. London, 1901.

The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II., The Reformation. London and New York, 1904. A valuable collection of treatises on the several phases of the Reformation, by competent scholars; enriched by extensive bibliographical lists.

H. Baumgarten: Karl der Fünfte, 3 vols. Stuttgart, 1885–92.

E. Armstrong: Charles the Fifth, 2 vols. London, 1902.

J. H. Robinson: History of Western Europe. New York, 1903.

L. Pastor: Geschichte der Päpste. Freiburg, 1888 seq. English translation, London, 1891 seq.

Universal Histories. (1) *In England:* by W. C. Taylor, Modern Hist., 1838; new ed. 1866; Ancient Hist., 1839; new ed. 1867. By A. F. Tytler, 1801, and in numerous later editions. W. Russell and others, History of Modern Europe, 4 vols. 8vo. 1856. (2) *In Germany:* Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen — herausgegeben von Wilhelm Oncken (Editor and writer of portions): General History, more extensive than other general histories. In 4 divisions; 45 vols. in all; a general Index to the whole; high scholarly character of the work. In div. III. i. Gesch. d. deutsch Reformation, by Dr. F. von Bezold. III. 3. 1. hälfte, Gesch. d. Gegen Reformation, by Droysen; by Schlosser, 19 vols. 1844–57; by H. Leo, 6 vols., Halle, 1849 seq.; by Becker, 4th ed. 1900–1902. 12 vols.; by Dittmar, 4th ed. 1866, 6 vols.; by Weber, 2d ed. Leipzig, 1882–89, 15 vols. (3) *In Italy:* by Cesare Cantù, 35 vols., 8vo, 1837 seq. 10th ed. 1883–91. 16 vols. French transl., 19 vols., 8vo, 2d ed., 1854–55.

History of all Nations, 24 vols., edited by John Henry Wright; (a translation with additions by American contributors) of Allgemeine

Weltgeschichte von Flatke, Herzberg, Justi, Pflugk, Prutz, Philippson; Berlin (1885–92, 12 vols.). A briefer treatment, in part by the same writers who contributed to Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen, herausg. von W. Oncken. Smyth: Lectures on Modern History, Sparks' Am. ed., 2 vols., 1841.

Guizot: Lectures on the History of Civilization; English transl. by Henry. 8vo. New York, 1842.

Hegel: Philosophie d. Geschichte; Werke, ix. Berlin, 1840. 8vo.

General Biographical Works. A. Chalmers: Biographical Dictionary. 32 vols. 8vo. 1812–17. Biographie Universelle, 52 vols., 8vo, et supplement, volumes 53 à 85. Paris, 1811–62. Nouvelle édition, revue, corrigée, et augmentée, 45 vols., 1842–65. L'Art de vérifier. les Dates des faits historiques, etc., depuis la naissance de Jésus Christ (to 1770). 18 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1819. Biographie Générale (nouvelle) depuis les temps les plus reculés, avec les renseignements bibliograph., etc. 46 vols. 8vo. 1857–66. The Dictionary of National Biography (English). London, 1885–1903, 67 vols.

Wetzer u. Welte (Roman Catholic): Kirchenlexicon oder Encyklopädie d. kath. Theologie. 12 vols. Freiburg, 2 ed. 1886–1903.

Herzog (Protestant): Real-Encycl. für protestantische Theologie u. Kirche. 2d ed. 21 vols.; and Register, 1 vol. Hamburg. 3d ed., edited by Hauck, 1896 [–1905, v. 1–16]. Leipzig.

These copious works embody the results of German Theological study, apart from Biblical criticism, in the branches of the Church to which they severally belong.

Works in Ecclesiastical History, treating of the Reformation as a Whole

Gieseler: Lehrbuch d. Kirchengsch. Bd. iii. in 2 pts. Bonn, 1840–53. 8vo. (The 4th vol. in Prof. H. B. Smith's Engl. translation, New York, 1862.)

H. B. Smith: History of the Church of Christ in Chronological Tables. New York, 1861. Fol. This embodies a great amount of historical information within a brief compass.

Raynaldus: Annales Ecclesiastici. (1195–1565.) Colon. 1694. 9 vols. Fol. Raynaldus is the most eminent of the continuators of Baronius, and a representative of Roman orthodoxy.

Natalis Alexander: Historia eccl. V. et N. Test. (16 centuries.) Paris 1699. 8 t. Fol. Ed. Mansi, Ferrara, 1758. Bassano, 1778. Natalis is the champion of the Gallican ecclesiastical theory.

Hase: Kirchengsch. (1 vol.) Eng. transl. by Blumenthal and Wing, New York, 1856, 8vo. Hase's work is remarkable for its condensation; it is founded on extensive researches, and is written with much vivacity.

Baur: Kirchengsch. Bd. iv. Die neuere Zeit. Leipz., 1863. 8vo. Baur is one of the most perspicuous, as well as learned, of the German Church historians.

Guericke: Kirchengsch., Bd. 3. 9th ed. Leipzig, 1867. 8vo. Guericke treats of the Reformation from the point of view of the strict Lutherans.

Hardwick: History of the Christian Church during the Reformation. 2d ed., 1865. 8vo. Hardwick writes from the point of view of the Anglican Church. His manual is full in its references to authorities.

Merle d'Aubigné: Hist. de la Réformation du 16me Siècle: Translated from the French. (In numerous editions.)

Beausobre: Hist. de la Réformation. Berlin, 1786. 4 vols. 8vo.

Mosheim: Institutiones Hist. Eccl. Helmst., 1764. 4to. (Murdock's Translation.)

Schröckh: Kirchengeschichte seit d. Reformation. 10 vols. Leipzig, 1804–1812.

Kurtz: Kirchengeschichte. 13th German ed. Leipzig, 1899.

Niedner: Kirchengsch. 8vo. Berlin, 1866. One of the most learned and valuable of all the German manuals, although clumsy in its literary execution.

J. I. Ritter (Roman Catholic): Kirchengsch. 6th ed. 2 vols. 8vo. Bonn, 1862. Moderate and candid in its tone.

Alzog (Roman Catholic): Handbuch d. Kirchengsch. 10th ed. 1882. 2 vols. Mainz, 1866–68. This is written in a truly scientific spirit.

Riffel (Roman Catholic): Kirchengsch. d. neuesten Zeit von Anfang d. 16. Jahrh. 3 vols. 8vo. Mainz, 1842–47.

H. Stebbing: History of the Reformation. 2 vols. (In Lardner's Cab. Cyclopædia) 1836. Lond. 16mo.

J. Tulloch: Leaders of the Reformation: Luther, Calvin, Latimer, Knox. 8vo. 2d ed. Edinb. 1860.

Stephen: Essays in Eccl. Biography. 4th ed. 1860. Lond. 8vo.

M. J. Spalding (Roman Catholic): History of the Reformation. 4th ed. Baltimore, 1866. 8vo.

F. Seebohm: The Era of the Protestant Revolution. London, 1874.

G. Kawerau: Reformation und Gegenreformation. (Vol. III.: of W. Möller, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 2d ed.) Freiburg, 1899.

W. Walker: The Reformation. New York, 1900.

K. Müller: Kirchengeschichte, Vol. II. Tübingen, 1902.

Polemical and Critical Writings

(1) *Roman Catholic.* Maimbourg: Hist. du Luthéranisme, Paris, 1680: also, Hist. du Calvinisme, 1682. Bossuet: Hist. des Variations des Églises Protest., Paris, 1688, nouv. éd., Œuvres de Bossuet, tomes v. et vi. Paris, 1836. 8vo. Varillas: Hist. des Révolutions arrivées en Matière de Religion. 6 vols. Paris, 1689. 4to.

Döllinger: Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwickelung u. ihre Wirkungen. 3 vols. Regensburg, 1848. The work is carried no farther than the

"Umfang des lutherischen Bekenntnisses." Döllinger's work is largely a collection of materials. It relates chiefly to the defects of the Reformers and of their work. It may profitably be compared with his Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches (Munich, 1872). Balmes: Protestantism and Catholicity compared in their effects on Civilization. Transl. from the Spanish. 8vo. Baltimore, 1851. An elaborate controversial work in reply to Guizot's Lectures on Civilization, by a Spanish Priest. It ends with the sentence: "As soon as the Sovereign Pontiff, the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, shall pronounce sentence against any one of my opinions, I will hasten to declare that I consider that opinion erroneous, and cease to profess it."

Protestant. Bayle: Critique Générale de l'Histoire du Calvinisme de Maimbourg, Amsterdam, 1684. 3d ed. Hagenbach: Vorlesungen über d. Kirchengsch. New ed. Leipz., 1868, seq. (Chiefly upon the Ref. in Germany and Switzerland.) Schenkel: Das Wesen des Protestantismus. 2d ed. Schaffhausen, 1862. 8vo. Hundeshagen: Der Deutsche Protestantismus. Frankfort. 8vo. 3d ed. 1849. (Relating especially to German Protestantism, but with a more general bearing.) Roussel: Les Nations Cath. et les Nations Prot. 2 vols. Paris. 8vo. 1854. Polemical against Romanism.

Villers: Essai sur l'Esprit et l'Influence de la Réf. de Luther. Paris, 1804. 8vo. Engl. transl., Philadelphia, 1883.

Laurent: La Réforme (in Études sur l'Histoire de l'Humanité, t. viii.). 8vo. Brussels, 1861.

The German and Swiss (Zwinglian and Calvinistic) Reformation

Contemporary Sources for Both Countries. J. Sleidan (d. 1556): De Statu Religionis et Reipublicæ, Carolo V. Cæsare, Commentarii. Folio. Amsterdam, 1555; best ed., Frankfort, 1785–6. 3 vols. 8vo. English translation, by Bohun, London, 1689. Folio. 3 vols. 4to. French translation, with the notes of Le Courayer, 1767.

Sleidan was born at Sleida, near Cologne, in 1506. After completing his education, he lived for a number of years in France, was in the service of Francis I., and the interpreter of his embassy at Hagenau (1540). In 1542, he entered the service of the Smalcaldic League, and in 1545 was commissioned by it to write a history of the Reformation. He accompanied a Protestant embassy to England; went, in 1551, to the Council of Trent, as a commissioner from Strasburg, and in 1544, in the same capacity to the Conference of Nuremberg. He was versed in literature, law, and political science, of a dispassionate, judicial temper, and careful in his researches.

Later Authorities. Abr. Scultetus (Prof. at Heidelberg; d. 1624): Annalium Evangelii passim per Europam decimo sexto Salutis partæ seculo renovati, Decas I. et II. (from 1516–1536). Heidelberg, 1618–20. Reprinted in V. d. Hardt. Hist. liter. Reformationis.

Gerdesius (Prof. at Gröningen, d. 1765): Introd. in Hist. Evangel. sec. xvi. passim per Europam renovati. Groning. 1744–52. Tom. iv. 4to. Also, his collection of documents: Scrinium Antiquarium, etc. Tom. viii. 4to. 1748–1763.

History of the German Reformation

Contemporary Sources. G. Spalatinus (d. 1545): Annales Reformationis (published by Cyprian. 8vo. Leipzig, 1718).

Spalatin was born in 1484, and died in 1545. He was court preacher and private secretary to the Electors of Saxony, Frederic, John, and John Frederic. He was present at the Diet of Augsburg in 1518, at the election of Charles V. at Frankfort, in 1519, at his coronation at Cologne in 1520, at the Diet of Worms in 1521, at the Diets of Nuremberg in 1523 and 1524, in 1526 at Spires, in 1530 at Augsburg, in 1537 at the Convention at Smalcald, and at other important assemblies. He took part in the visitation of the Saxon Churches. He was an intimate friend and correspondent of Luther, Melancthon, Bugenhagen, and the other Saxon Reformers.

G. Spalatin's Historischer Nachlass u. Briefe. Bd. i.: Das Leben u. die Zeitgeschichte Friedrichs des Weisen. 8vo. Jena, 1851.

F. Myconius (d. 1546): Hist. Reformationis (by Cyprian. 2d ed. 8vo. Leipzig, 1718).

Myconius was born in 1491 and died in 1546. He was held in high esteem by Luther and Melancthon, and efficiently coöperated with them in their work.

Ph. Melancthon: Hist. Vitæ Mart. Lutheri. (Preface to Lutheri Opp. Lat., Vitemberg, 1546; and in separate editions, e.g. Vol. VI. of the Corpus Reformatorum.)

J. Mathesius (d. 1564): Historie von D. Martin Luther's Anfang Lehren, Leben, etc. (in 27 sermons). 4to. Nürnberg, 1566. Best edition, G. Lösche, Prag, 1896.

Mathesius became a student at Wittenberg in 1528, and lived for a time in Luther's family. He died in 1564.

J. Camerarius: De Phil. Melancthonis Ortu, totius Vitæ Curriculo et Morte, etc. 8vo. Leipzig, 1566.

Camerarius was born in 1500 and died in 1574. He was a pupil of Luther and Melancthon, and was especially attached to the latter.

Cochlæus (Rom. Cath., d. 1552): Commentaria de Actis et Scriptis M. Lutheri, etc. (from 1517–1546). Mogunt., 1549; Paris, 1565. Cologne, 1568.

Cochlæus was an active polemic. He was at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530.

Surius (Rom. Cath., d. 1578): Comment. brevis Rerum in Orbe Gestarum ab anno 1500 usque 1566. Cologne, 1568.

Collections of Documents. Loscher: Vollständigen Reformations-acta u. documenta (from 1517–1519). 3 vols. 4to. Leipzig, 1720–29.

Tetzel: Hist. Bericht v. Anfang u. Fortgang d. Ref. Luth. (by Cyprian. Leipzig, 1718). Kapp: Kleine Nachlese zur Ref. Gsch. nützlicher Urkunden. Leipzig, 1727. Strobel: Miscellaneen u. Beiträge zur Lit. Nürnb., 1775 seq., 1784 seq. Förstemann: Archiv für die Gsch. d. Ref., Halle, 1831 seq.; neues Urkundenbuch, Hamburg, 1842. Neudecker: Urkunden aus d. Ref.-Zeit, Cassel, 1836. Merkwürdige Actenstücke aus der Zeitalt. d. Ref., Nürnb. 1838. Neue Beitrage zur Gsch. d. Ref. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1841.

O. Schade: Satiren u. Pasquille a. d. Ref.-Zeit. Hannov. 1856–8 (3 vols.). Johannsen: Die Entwickl. d. prot. Geistes e. Sammlung d. wichtigsten Dokumente v. Worms. Edict b. z. Sp. Prot. Copenhagen, 1830. H. van d. Hardt: Historia Literaria Reformationis. Franc. and Leipzig, 1717.

K. Hegel: Chroniken der deutschen Städte. 29 vols. Leipzig, 1869–1902.

Archiv für Oesterreichische Geschichte. 86 vols. Vienna, 1848–1903.

A. Gindély: Monumenta Historica Bohemica. Prag, 1865–70.

W. Altmann: Ausgewählte Urkunden zur brandenburg-preussischen Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte. Berlin, 1897.

P. Tschakert: Urkundenbuch zur Reformationsgeschichte des Herzogthums Preussen. Leipzig, 1900.

C. A. Ackermann: Bibliotheca Hessiaca. Cassel, 1884–99.

M. Lenz: Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps von Hessen mit Bucer. Berlin, 1880 seq.

G. Buchholtz: Bibliothek der sächsischen Geschichte. Leipzig, 1902 seq.

C. A. Burckhardt: Ernestinische Landtagsakten. Jena, 1902.

Publikationen der sächische Kommission für Geschichte (in progress).

D. Schäfer: Württembergische Geschichtequellen. Stuttgart, 1894 seq.

V. Ernst: Briefwechsel des Herzogs Christoph von Württemberg. Stuttgart, 1899–1901.

H. Birck: Die politische Correspondenz der Stadt Strassburg in Zeitalter der Reformation. Strassburg, 1882 seq.

Works of the Reformers. Luther's Works: Wittenberg ed., the German, 1539–1559, 12 vols., fol.; the Latin, 1545–1558, 7 vols., fol.; Jena ed., the German, 8 vols., fol.; the Latin, 4 vols., fol., 1555–1558 (from the autographs, except the first part of the German works); Altenburg ed., the German works alone, 10 vols., 1661–1664. Supplement. vol. to all the earlier edd., by Zeidler, Halle, 1702. Leipzig ed., 22 vols., fol., 1729–1740. Halle ed., by J. G. Walch (the most complete), 24 Thle., 1740–1750. In the last two of these edd., Latin works only in a German transl. Erlangen ed., by Plochmann u. Irmischer, 67 vols., 1826–79. Die reformatorischen Schriften Luthers in chronol. Folge, edited by K. Zimmermann. 4 vols. Darmstadt, 1846–50. Vollständige Auswahl Luther's Hauptschriften, by Otto von Gerlach, 1840–1848. 24 vols. (Fabricius, Centifolium Luth. s. notitia literaria scriptorum de Luthero editorum, Hamburg, 1728.) Luther's Briefe, Sendschreiben u. Bedenken, edited by De Wette, 6 vols. 1825–56. Luther's Briefwechsel, a supplem. vol.,

by Burkhardt (1866). The best edition of Luther's works is that in course of publication under the editorship of F. Knaake and others, Weimar, 1883 seq. 20 vols. have appeared.

For the 95 theses and the great tracts of 1520 in English translation, see Wace and Buchheim: First Principles of the Reformation. London and Philadelphia, 1885.

Melancthon's Works: Basel. 1541. 5 vols. Fol. C. Peucer's ed., Wittenberg, 1562, 4 vols., fol.; Bretschneider's ed. (in the Corpus Reformatorum), 1834–1860, 28 vols., 4to.

Jonas's Works, edited by Kawerau, Halle, 1884, 1885; Bugenhagen's Briefwechsel, edited by Vogt, Stettin, 1888; Erasmus's Works, edited by Le Clerc, Leyden, 1703–06, 10 vols.

Historical Works. SECKENDORF (d. 1692): Commentarius Historicus et Apologeticus de Lutheranismo, libb. iii. ed. 2. Leipzig, 1694.

Seckendorf was born in 1626, and died 1692. He was educated at Strasburg. Under the Duke of Gotha, Duke Maurice of Zeitz, and the Elector Frederic III. of Brandenburg, he held responsible offices. He was a statesman of thorough education and of exemplary integrity. His History, which was occasioned by the work of the Jesuit Maimbourg, was founded on the most industrious examination of original documents.

Salig: Vollständige Hist. d. Augsb. Confession u. derselb. Apologie (1517–1562). 3 Th. Halle, 1730–1745.

Planck: Gsch. d. Entstehung, d. Veränderungen, u. d. Bildung uns. prot. Lehrbegriffs b. z. d. Concordienformel. 6 vols. 2 ed. Leipzig, 1791–1800. Woltmann: Gsch. d. Ref. in Deutschland. 3 Th. Altona, 1801–1805.

Spieker: Gsch. Dr. M. Luthers u. der durch ihn bewirkten Kirchenref. in Deutschl. 1 vol. (to 1521). Berlin, 1818.

MARHEINEKE: Gsch. d. deutsch. Ref. 4 Th. Berlin, 1816–34 (a second ed. of Parts 1 and 2, 1831). This is still one of the best of the histories of the German Reformation. Gsch. d. deutsch. Reformation, by von Bezold (Berlin, 1890), quite valuable. See Oncken, Allgem. Gsch. (p. 568). Ch. Villers: Essai sur l'Esprit et l'Influence de la Réf. de Luther. Paris, 1804: translated into German, 2d ed., 1828, and into English, Phil., 1833.

K. A. Menzel: Neuere Gsch. d. Deutschen v. d. Ref. b. z. Bundesacte. Breslau, 1826–39. Translated into English, 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1849.

Kohlrausch: Geschichte Deutschlands. Engl. transl. 8vo. 1848.

L. RANKE: Deutsche Gsch. im Zeitalter d. Reformation. 7 vols., 4th ed., 1869. London and New York, 1905. 1 vol. Translated in part, by Sarah Austin. 3 vols. 8vo. 1845–47.

K. Hagen: Deutschland's literar. u. relig. Verhältnisse im Ref. Zeitalter. 3 vols. Erlangen, 1841–44. D. F. Strauss: Ulrich von Hutten. 2d ed., 1871. Ward: House of Austria in the Thirty Years' War. London, 1869. Trench: Gustavus Adolphus in Germany, and other lectures on the Thirty Years' War. 2d ed., 1872. Droysen: Leben von Gustav. Adolf. 1868.

Philip Schaff: History of the Christian Church, Vol. VI. New York, 1888.

J. Janssen: Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalten, edited by L. Pastor, Freiburg, 1897; English translation, London, 1896–1903, 6 vols.

K. Lamprecht: Deutsche Geschichte, Vol. V. Berlin, 1894.

K. W. Nizsch: Geschichte des deutschen Volkes bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1883–85.

S. R. Gardiner: The Thirty Years' War. London, 1874. A. Gindély: The Thirty Years' War. English translation, New York, 1898.

C. R. L. Fletcher: Gustavus Adolphus. New York, 1890.

W. W. Rockwell: Die Doppelehe des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen. Marburg, 1904.

L. Keller: Die Reformation und die älteren Reformpartien. Leipzig, 1885.

Lutheran Theology. Melancthon: Loci Communes, in original form, edited by Plitt and Kolde. 3d ed., 1900. T. Harnack: Luther's Theologie, mit besondere Beziehung auf seine Versöhnungs- und Erlösungslehre, 1862, 1886. J. Köstlin: Luther's Theologie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und ihrem inneren Zusammenhange, 1863; new editions, 1883, 1901; in English translation by Hay, The Theology of Luther, Philadelphia, 1897. G. Plitt: Einleitung in die Augustana, 1867, 1868. The appropriate sections of: A. Harnack: Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, 3d ed., Freiburg, 1897; F. Loofs: Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte, 3d ed., Halle, 1893 (a new edition will soon appear). R. Seeberg: Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, Erlangen, 1898. G. P. Fisher: History of Christian Doctrine, New York, 1896.

Lives of the German Reformers. Melchior Adamus: Vitæ Germanorum Theologorum, etc. Heidelberg, 1620. Ulenberg (a Protestant, then a Catholic, d. 1617): Vitæ haeresiarcharum Lutheri, Melancthonis, Majoris, Illyrici, Osiandri. Colon., 1589. *Lives of Erasmus:* J. Le Clerc: Vie d'Érasme, Amsterdam, 1703. S. Knight: The Life of Erasmus, Cambridge, 1728. F. Seebohm: The Oxford Reformers, London, 1867. J. A. Froude: Life and Letters of Erasmus, London, 1894. E. Emerton: Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam, New York, 1899. *Lives of Luther:* by Melancthon; by Mathesius (see above); by Walther, Jena, 1704–54, 2 Th.; by Keil, Leipzig, 1753, 4 Th.; by Ukert, Gotha, 1817, 2 Th.; by Jakel, 1840; by Jurgens [up to 1517], Leipzig, 1846 seq., 3 vols.; by Gelzer, with König's illustrations, Hamburg, 1847–51 (translated, London and New York, 1857); by Stang, Stuttgart, 1835–38; by Pfitzer, Stuttgart, 1836; by Genthe, Halle, 1841–45; by Wildenbaln, Leipzig, 1850–52, 4 Th.; by Ledderhose, Speir, 1836; by Meurer, Dresden, 3d ed., 1870; by Döllinger (from the Kirchenlexicon), translated, London, 1851; by Audin, Paris, 2 vols., translated, Phil., 1841; a storehouse of calumnies; by Michelet, translated from the French, in Bohn's Library; Hare, Vindication of Luther against his English assailants. 1854. This is a Reply to Sir Wm. Hamilton (Discussions in Philosophy and Liter-

ature); also, to Hallam, to J. H. Newman, and W. G. Ward. The charge of "Rationalism" and other imputations against Luther are fully considered, and various mistakes of Hamilton are exposed. J. Köstlin: Martin Luther, sein Leben und seine Schriften, 2 vols. Leipzig, 1875. T. Kolde: Martin Luther, Eine Biographie, 2 vols. Gotha, 1884, 1893. A. E. Berger: Martin Luther in Kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung, 2 vols., Berlin, 1895. H. E. Jacobs: Martin Luther, New York, 1898. T. M. Lindsey: Luther and the German Reformation, Edinburgh, 1900.

Lives of Melancthon: by Camerarius (see above); Als Præceptor Germaniæ, by A. H. Niemeyer, Halle, 1817; by Facius, 1832; by Galle, Charakteristik Melancthons, 2d ed., Halle, 1845; by Matthes, 1841; Leben u. Wirken Phil. Mel., Altenb., 2d ed. 1846; by Ledderhose (translated by G. F. Krotel, New York, 1854); by Cox, London, 1815, Boston, 1835. J. W. Richard: Philip Melanchthon, New York, 1898. G. Ellinger, Philip Melanchthon, Ein Lebensbild, Berlin, 1902.

Leben u. ausgewählte Schriften d. Väter u. Begründer d. luth. Kirche, 1861 seq.: Melancthon, by C. Schmidt; Brenz, by J. Hartmann; Urbanus Rhegius, by G. Uhlhorn; Justus Jonas, by Cruciger; P. Speratus, L. Spengler, N. v. Amsdorf, Paul Eber, M. Chemnitz, D. Chrytæus, by Pressel.

G. Bayer: Johannes Brenz, Stuttgart, 1899. J. W. Baum: Capito und Bucer, Elberfeld, 1860. A. Erichson: Martin Butzer, Strassburg, 1891. L. W. Graepp: Johannes Bugenhagen, Gütersloh, 1897. H. Barge: Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, Leipzig, 1905. G. Kawerau: Johann Agricola, Berlin, 1881. W. Möller, Andreas Osiander, Elberfeld, 1870. P. E. Mosen: Hieronymus Emser, Leipzig, 1890. T. Wiedemann, Johann Eck, Regensburg, 1865.

The History of the Swiss (Zwinglian and Calvinistic) Reformation

Contemporary Sources. B. Weiss (d. 1531): Kurze Beschreibung d. Glaubensänderung im Schweizerlande (in Füsslin's Beiträge, iv. 32). V. Anshelm: Berner Chronik bis 1526 (Berne, 1825–33). H. Bullinger (d. 1575): Reformationsgeschichte (to 1532). Frauenfeld, 1838–40. Bullinger was born in 1504, succeeded Zwingli at Zurich in 1531, and died in 1575. He was one of the most distinguished of the Reformers of his age, and an entirely trustworthy writer. J. Salat (Catholic), Valentin Tschudi (Catholic), Egidius Tschudi (Catholic): authors of works extant in manuscripts: See Gieseler, iv. i. 1. Fromment: Les Actes et les Gestes de la Cité de Genève. Genève, 1536. 8vo. Fromment was a Frenchman, an associate of Farel, and one of the first to preach Protestantism in Geneva. Later in life, he was deposed from the ministry and held the office of Notary. His Chronicle covers the period from 1532 to 1536, and is a trustworthy narrative. V. Tschudi: Chronik der Reformationsjahre, 1521–1531, edited by J. Strickler, Bern, 1889.

B. Wyss: Chronik, edited by G. Finsler. Basel, 1901.

Original Documents. Works of the Reformers: see below. Miscellanea Tigurina. 3 Th. Zurich, 1722–24. J. C. Füsslin: Beiträge z. Erläut d. Kirchen-Reformationsgesch. d. Schweizerlandes. Zurich, 1741–53. Ejusd. Epistolæ ab. Eccl. Helvet. Reformatoribus vel ad eos scriptæ. Tiguri, 1742. J. J. Simler: Sammlung alter u. neuer Urkunden z. Beleuchtung d. Kirchengesch. vornehmlich des Schweizerlandes. Zurich, 1767. E. Egli: Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Züricher Reformation, Zurich, 1879.

J. Strickler: Actensammlung zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte, Zurich, 1877–1884.

Works of the Reformers. U. Zwinglii opera, first complete ed. by Schuler and Schulthess, 8 vols. Zurich, 1828–42. Sammtliche Werke unter Mitwirkung des Zwingli-Vereins in Zürich v. Egli und Finsler, Berlin, 1904. S. M. Jackson: Zwingli Selections, New York, 1901. J. Calvini, opera theologica, 12 vols., Geneva, 1556; 9 vols., Amsterdam, 1667. Best edition by Baum, Cunitz, and Reuss: Bruns. 1863–1900, 59 vols. English translation of Calvin's Writings, 52 volumes, Edinburgh, 1842 seq. Letters of Calvin, edited by Bonnet: English translation, 4 vols., Philadelphia, 1855.

Historical and Biographical Works. J. H. Hottinger (d. 1667): Hist. Eccl. 1655–57. J. J. Hottinger (d. 1735): Hist. d. Ref. in d. Eidgenossenschaft. 4 Th. Zurich, 1708. Basnage: Hist. de la Religion des Églises Réform: a la Haye (1690), 1721, 4to. A. Ruchat: Hist. de la Réformation de la Suisse. 6 vols. Geneva, 1727 seq. L. Wirz: Neuere helvet. Kirchengeschichte. 2 vols. (to 1523); the second by M. Kirchhofer, 1813, 1819. Hess: Ursprung, Gang u. Folgen d. durch Zwingli in Zürich bewirkten Glaubensverbesserung u. Kirchenreform. Zurich, 1819. J. v. Muller u. R. G. Blotzheim: Geschichte schweizerischer Eidgenossenschaft, continued by J. J. Hottinger (to 1531). Zurich, 1825 and 1829. Gaberel: Hist. de l'Église de Genève, 2 vols., 1853. D'Istria: La Suisse Allemande. Switzerland, the Pioneer of the Ref., 2 vols. London, 1858. Hundeshagen: Zur Charakteristik Zwinglis, etc. Studien u. Kritiken, 1862. Mignet: Mémoires Hist. 3d ed. Paris, 1854. It contains an Essay on Calvinism in Geneva. Mosheim: Neue Nachr. von Servet; also, Ketzergsch., ii. (1748). Charpenne: Histoire de la Réforme de Genève. 8vo. 1861. A. Roget: Histoire du peuple de Genève, Geneva, 1870–1883; E. Choisy: La théocratie à Genève au temps de Calvin, Geneva, 1897. E. Choisy: L'État chrétien calviniste à Genève au temps de Bèze, Geneva, 1902.

Lives of Zwingli: by Myconius (see above); by J. G. Hess, Engl. transl., by L. Aiken, 1812, and translated from the French into the German, with an added Appendix, by L. Usteri, 1811; by J. M. Schuler, 1819; by Roeder, 1855; by J. Tichler, 1827; by Robbins, Bib. Sacra, vols. ii. and iii.; by Christoffel (in the Leben u. Ausgewählte Schriften d. Väter u. Begründer d. reformirten Kirche), 1857; by J. C. Mörikofer: Ulrich Zwingli nach den urkundlichen Quellen, Leipzig,

1867–69. R. Stähelin: Huldreich Zwingli, Basel, 1895–97. S. M. Jackson: Huldreich Zwingli, New York, 1901. S. Simpson: Life of Ulrich Zwingli, New York, 1902.

Lives of Beza. J. W. Baum: Theodor Beza, Leipzig, 1843, 1852. H. M. Baird, Theodore Beza, New York, 1899. *Other Swiss Reformers.* Bertold Haller, oder die Reformation von Bern, by M. Kirchhofer, Zurich, 1828. Lebensgeschichte von Oekolampadius, by Hess. Zurich, 1793; by Herzog, 2 vols., Basel, 1843; Das Leben Wilh. Farels, v. M. Kirchhofer, 2 vols. Zurich, 1831. Lives of Farel, Fromment, Viret, by Chenevière, Genève, 1835. Life of Farel, by Schmidt. Strasburg, 1834. Life of Viret, by Jaquemont. Strasburg, 1836. In the series, entitled, Leben u. Ausgewählte Schriften d. Väter u. Begründer d. fer. Kirche: Zwingli, by Christoffel; Oecolampadius and Myconius, by Hagenbach; Calvin, by Stähelin; Capito and Bucer, by Baum; Bullinger, Haller, and Leo Judä, by Pestalozzi; Capito and Beza, by Heppe; Peter Martyr, by Schmidt, 1859; Olevanius and Ursinus, by Südhoff, 1858; Farel and Viret, by C. Schmidt; Vadian and Blaurer, by Pressel; Knox, by Brandes.

Lives of Calvin, by Beza, translated by Gibson, Phila., 1836; by Waterman, London, 1813; by T. Smyth, Phil., 1835; by Henry, 3 vols., Hamburg, 1835–1844, translated into English by Stebbing, 1844; by E. Stähelin, 1863; by Bungener, 2d ed., 12mo, 1863; by Guizot (St. Louis and Calvin); by Kampschulte (Roman Catholic), vol. i., 1869. vol. ii., 1899. A. Lefranc: La Jeunesse de Calvin, Paris, 1888. P. Schaff: History of the Christian Church, Vol. VII., New York, 1892. E. Doumergue: Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps. A monumental work to be completed in five vols., 3 vols. published, Lausanne, 1899–1905.

The Reformation in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden

In Heeren u. Ukert's Staatengeschichte: Dänemark, by Dahlmann. Harald Hurtfeld: Dänische Chronik. Copenhagen, 1604. J. Baez: Inventarium Eccl. Sueco-Gothor. Lincop., 1642. 4to. Celsius: Gsch. Gustav. I., from the Swedish. Copenhagen and Leipzig, 1754. Pontoppidan: Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ. Copenhagen, 1741. Also, Reformationshistorie d. dän. Kirche, 1734. Münter: Kirchengsch. v. Dän. u. Norw. 1823–33. Also, Danske Reformationshistorie. Copenhagen, 1802. Schinmeier: Lebensbeschreib. d. drei schwed. Reformatoren. Lüb., 1783. Troil: Skrifter och Handlingar till uplisning i. Svenska Kyrko och Reformations-Historia. Upsala, 1790. Thyselius: Handlingar till Sverges Reformations och Kyrkohistoria under Konung Gustaf I. (1523–61). Stockholm, 1841–45. By the same author: Einführung d. Ref. in Schweden bis 1527 (in Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. 1846). Römer: De Gustavo I. rer. sacr. in Suecià instauratore. Ultraj, 1840. A. Theiner: Versuche d. heilig. Stuhls in d. letzten

drei Jahrh., den Norden wieder mit d. Kirche zu vereinen. Augsburg, 1838. Münter: Symbolæ ad illustrand Bugenhagii in Dania Commorationem. Havn., 1836. By the same: De Confutatione latina quæ Apologiæ Evangelicor. in Comitiis Havemensib. anno 1530, traditæ opposita est. Havn., 1847. L. Helvig: Danske Kirkeshistorie after Reformationen. Copenhag., 1851. Dunham: Hist. of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway (in Lardner's Cab. Cycl., 1840). J. Finnius: Hist. Eccles. Islandiæ, 1772–8. 4 vols. 4to. G. L. Baden: Hist. of Denmark. 5 vols. Copenhagen, 1829–32. Geijer: History of Sweden, translated by Turner. 8vo. 1845. Anders Tryxell: Hist. of Sweden, translated and edited by Mary Howitt. London, 1844. A. C. Bang: Den Norske Kirkes Historie i det 16 Aarhundrede, Christiana, 1901. F. Barfod: Danmarks Historie fra 1319 til 1670. Copenhagen, 1885–1893. J. Wiedling: Schwedische Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation, Gotha, 1882. C. A. Cornelius: Svenska Kyrkans Historia efter Reformationen, Upsala, 1886 seq.

The Reformation in Bohemia and Moravia

A. Gindély: Böhmen u. Mähren im Zeitalt. d. Reformation (2 vols.). Prague, 1637. Gsch. d. böhmischen Brüder. Prague (2 vols.). 1857 seq. Czerwenka: Gsch. d. evangel. Kirche in Böhmen. 2 vols. 8vo. Leipzig, 1869–70. Pescheck: Gsch. d. Gegenreformat. in Böhmen (2 vols.), 2d ed. Leipzig, 1850. The Reformation and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia. 2 vols. London, 1845. Ehwalt: Die alte u. neue Lehre d. böhm. Brüder. Dantzig, 1756. K. A. Müller: Fünf Bücher vom böhmisch. Kriege. Dresden, 1840. Tomek: Geschichte Böhmens. Palacky: Böhmens Geschichte. Vols. 1–5. 1836–67. 8vo. Palacky: Geschichte von Böhmen (to 1526). 5 vols. 1836–67. Niemeyer: Collectio Confessionum, pp. 771–851. A. Bachmann: Geschichte Böhmens, Gotha, 1899.

A complete edition of the works of John Huss is now in process of publication by the firm of Jaroslaw Bursik of Prague. The first installment, containing Huss's *Expositio Decalogi*, appeared in 1903.

The Reformation in Poland

Regenvolscius: Syst. hist. Chron. Eccl. Slavonicarum. Ultraj, 1652. 4to. Lubienicius: Hist. Ref. Polon. Freist. 1685. Schicksale d. pol. Dissidentium (3 vols.). 1768 seq. Salig: Historie d. Augsb. Confession, ii. 515. Friese: Kirchengeschichte d. Königreichs Polen (2 Th.). Breslau, 1786. 8vo. Krasinski: History of the Reformation in Poland (2 vols.). 8vo. London, 1840; by the same: Sketch of the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations. Edinburgh, 1851. Dunham: History of Poland (in Lardner's Cab. Cycl.). 1841. N. A. de Salvandy: Hist. de Pologne avant et sous J. Sobieski. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1855. J. Fletcher: History of Poland, London. 1831. J. Lelevel: Histoire de Pologne. 2 vols. Paris, 1844. 8vo.

R. Roepell: Gsch. von Polen. Hamburg, 1841. Fasti Polonici, 1624 seq., Breslau, 1854. Lubowitsch: Istoria Reformazii v Polschje, Warsaw, 1883. Krause: Die Reformation und Gegenreformation in Polen, Posen, 1901. See, also, Dalton: Johann à Lasco, Gotha, 1881. J. H. Allen: A History of the Unitarians, New York, 1894, Chapters III., IV.

The Reformation in Hungary and Transylvania

Ribinus: Memorab. Aug. Conf. in Hungaria. 2 vols. Presb., 1787. J. Burius: Hist. Dipl. de Statu Relig. evang. in Hung. 1710. Fol. Salig: Gsch. d. Augsb. Conf., ii. 803. [P. Ember]: Hist. Eccl. Ref. in Hung. et Transyl., ed Lampe, Traj. 1728. 4to. Péterffy: Sacra Concil. Eccl. Romano-Cathol. in Regno Hung. celebrata, MXVI. usque ad. a. MDCCXXXIV. 2 vols. Fol. Vienna, 1742. Schmal: Monumenta Evangel. Aug. Confessionis in Hungaria historica. 8vo. Pesth. 1861. Memorab. August. Confessionis in Regno Hung. de Ferdinando I. usque ad Carolum VI. 2 vols. 1786–9. 8vo. Kurze Gsch. d. evang. luther. Kirche in Ungarn vom Anfange d. Ref. bis Leopold II. Göttingen, 1794. 8vo. Die wichtigsten Schicksale d. evang. Kirche Augsb. Bekennt. in Ungarn von J. 1522 bis 1608. Leipzig, 1828. Hist. Eccl. Evang. Aug. Confessioni addictorum in Hung., etc. Halberstadt, 1830. Mailath: Gsch. d. Magjaren. 5 vols. 8vo. 1820–30; 2d ed., 1852–55. L. Szalay: Hist. Hungar. (to 1690). 5 vols. 8vo. Gsch. d. evang. Kirche in Ungarn, mit Rücksicht auf Siebenbürgen, Berlin, 1854. History of Protestantism in Hungary, with Preface by Dr. M. d'Aubigné, London, 1854. M. Horvath: Gsch. Ungarns. 2 vols. 8vo. Pesth, 1854. J. Paget: Hungary and Transylvania. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1839. J. A. Fessler: Gsch. d. Ungarn. 10 vols. 8vo. Leipzig, 1815–25. De Sary: Hist. Générale de Hongrie. 2 vols. 12mo. Paris, 1778. G. Haner: Hist. Eccless. Transylvan., 1694. 12mo. I. Benko: Transylvania, P. I., Tom. ii. (Vindob. 1778. 8vo), p. 121 (lib. iv. c. 12, De Statu Ecclesiastico). E. Csuday: Die Geschichte der Ungarn, Berlin, 1899. J. H. Allen: A History of the Unitarians, New York, 1894, Chapter V.

The Reformation in France

Documents and Contemporary Works. Hist. Eccl. des Églises Réf. au Royaume de France (to 1563). 3 vols. Antwerp, 1580. 8vo.

Serrarius (or De Serres): Comment. de Statu Relig. et Respubl. in Regno Galliæ (5 parts), 1570 seq.

F. Belcarius (Beaucaire de Peguillon, Bishop of Metz): Historia Gallica (1561–67). Lugd., 1625. Fol. Thuanus: Hist. sui Temporis, etc. (See above.)

Theod. Agrippa d'Aubigné: Histoire Universelle (1550–1601). Maillé, 1616–20. 3 vols. Fol. Nouv. éd. Vol. 1–9, Paris, 1866–97.

He was born in 1550, and died in 1630. The son of a devoted Huguenot, he fought in the siege of Orleans, when he was only thirteen years old. He was for a while an intimate associate of Henry IV. After writing this work, he resided in Geneva. He was a man of high character, deeply imbued with the religious feelings peculiar to the Huguenots.

Mémoires d'Agrippa d'Aubigné. 1 vol. 12mo. Paris, 1854.

A. L. Herminjard: Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les Pays de la Langue Française. Vols. 1–9. 1866–97.

Bulletin de la Société pour l'Histoire du Prot. Français (since 1850. It includes many documents illustrative of this period.).

Duplessis-Mornay: Mémoires et Correspondance. Paris, 1824–5.

Petitot: Mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire de France (1st series, 1819–26. 52 vols. 8vo. 2d series, 1820–29. 78 vols. 8vo.).

Among the works embraced in this collection are the Memoirs of Bouillon, vicomte de Turenne (from 1555–1584): he was grandson of the Const. Montmorenci; was converted to Calvinism, and was an adherent of Henry IV. Gamon (1560–86). Mergey (1556–89): he was born in 1536; he was at St. Quentin (1557), at Dreux (1562), and at Moncontour; and barely escaped the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Philippi (1562–90). Rabutin (1551–59). Saint Auban (1572 seq.). Tavannes (1560–96): he was born in 1555; fought for the League at Ivry; then served Henry IV. He died in 1633. Villeroi (1622–23). Du Bellay: L'Estoile (1589–1610). Sully: Mémoires. 6 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1827. Sully, the Prime Minister of Henry IV., was born in 1559, and died in 1641. La Noue (1562–70): he was born in 1531; took Orleans in 1567; fought at St. Quentin, Jarnac, and Moncontour; served Henry IV. with distinction. Montluc: he was born about 1502; was at the battle of Pavia (1525); took Boulogne (1547); defended Sienna (in 1554, under Henry II.); took part in the siege of Rochelle (1572). He was noted for his vigor and cruelty. Castelnau (1559–70): he was born about 1520; was at the siege of Rouen and at Dreux; was employed by Henry II., Charles IX., and Henry III. He was several times ambassador in England. He accompanied Mary, Queen of Scots, to Scotland, and befriended her afterwards. Journal de Henri III. (1574–89).

Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France [published by order of Louis Philippe]. Paris, 1835 seq.

Recueil des Lettres Missives de Henry IV. 7 vols. 4to. [In the above collection.] Paris, 1843–58.

Buchon: Collection des Chroniques et Mémoires sur l'Histoire de France, faisant partie de la Collection du *Panthéon Littéraire*. 1824 seq.

Michaud: Nouvelle Collection des Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de France depuis le XIII^{e} siècle jusqu'à la fin du XVIII^{e}. 3 Series. 34 vols. Paris, 1836 seq.

Archives Curieuses de l'Hist. de France depuis Louis XI. jusqu'à Louis XVIII. 27 vols. 8vo. En deux séries. Paris, 1834–40.

Brantôme: Œuvres Complètes. 7 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1822.

Brantôme was born about 1527, and died in 1614. He was chamberlain of Charles IX. and Henry III. He is a gossiping chronicler; but his works present a vivid portraiture of his time. Among them are the "Vies des Hommes Illustres," "Dames Illustres Françaises et Étrangéres," etc.

N. Weiss: La chambre ardente, Paris, 1889.

Historical Works. General Histories of France, by Anquetil; by Sismondi; by Michelet; by Henri Martin; by Dareste; by Lavisse; by Crowe, 5 vols. London, 1858–68. G. W. Kitchin: A History of France, 3 vols., 3d ed., Oxford, 1892–94.

Ranke: Französische Geschichte vornehmlich im 16. u. 17. Jahrh. 6 vols. 8vo. 1868. Engl. trans. Hist. of Civil Wars and Monarchy in France. 8vo. London, 1852.

W. Haag: La France Prot. ou Vies des Prot. Français. 9 tom. 8vo. 1847–59. 2d ed. Vols. 1–6, 1879–88.

G. Weber: Geschichtl. Darstellung d. Calvinism. im Verhältniss z. Staat in Genf u. Frankreich. Heidelb., 1836, 8vo.

Von Raumer: Gsch. Europas seit dem Ende d. 15 Jahrh. (See above.)

Capefigue: Hist. de la Réforme, de la Ligue, et du Règne de Henry IV. 8 tomes. Paris, 1834–5. 8vo.

Elie Benoist: Hist. de l'Édit de Nantes. 5 vols. 4to. Delft, 1693–5.

Herrman: Frankreich's Religiös- u. Bürgerkriege im 16. Jahrh. Leipzig, 1828. 8vo.

H. M. Baird: Rise of the Huguenots in France, the Huguenots and Henry of Navarre; The Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 6 vols., New York, 1879–1895.

De Félice: Hist. d. Protestants de France. 4th ed. 1861. 8vo. Engl. transl. by Lobdell, 1851. Soldan: Gsch. d. Protest. in Frankreich. 2 vols. 1855. 8vo. Von Polenz: Gsch. d. franz. Protestantismus. 5 vols. 1858 seq. 8vo. W. S. Browning: History of the Huguenots in the 16th century. 3 vols. 8vo. 1829–39. Smedley: History of the Reformed Religion in France. 3 vols. 12mo. London, 1832. (New York, 1834.) [Mrs. Marsh:] History of the Huguenots. 2 vols. 1847. 8vo. Ch. Brion: Liste chronolog. de l'Histoire Protest. en France jusqu'à la Révocat. de l'Édit de Nantes. 2 vols. 12mo. 1855. Anquez: Hist. d. Assemblées Polit. des Réformées de France (1573 to 1622). 8vo. Paris, 1859. Aymon: Tous les Synodes nationaux des Églises réformés, etc. La Haye, 1710. 2 vols. 4to. Quick: Synodicon in Gallia reformata, etc. 1682. 2 vols. Fol. W. Anderson: Hist. of France during the Reigns of Francis II. and Charles IX. 2 vols. London, 1769. Lacretelle: Hist. de France pendant les Guerres de Religion. 4 vols. 8vo. 1822. Morley: Clement Marot and other studies. 2 vols. 8vo. 1870. Duc d'Aumale: Lives of the Princes of Condé. Vols. 1, 2. 8vo. London, 1872. H. White: Massacre of St. Bartholomew, preceded by a narrative of the religious wars. London, 1868. Klipffel: Le Colloque de Poissy. 12mo. Brussels and Paris, 1867. Villemain: Vie de Chancellor d'Hôpital (in Études

d'Histoire Moderne. 1 vol. 8vo. 1854). Voltaire : Siècle de Louis XIV. (Œuvres, t. xxii.) Capefigue: Trois Siècles de l'Hist. de France, 1548–1848. 2 vols. 1852. 8vo. C. Schmidt: Gérard Roussel. 1845. 8vo. Puaux: Hist. de la Réforme Française. 2 tom. Paris, 1857–9. V. de Chalembert, Hist. de la Ligue, Henri III. et IV. 2 vols. 1854. 8vo. Aug. Theiner Hist. de l'Abjuration de Henri IV. 2 vols. 1852. 8vo. C. Schmidt: La Vie et les Travaux de Jean Sturm. 1855. 8vo. F. W. Ebeling: Sieben Bücher d. franz. Gsch. Bd. i. 1855. Anquetil L'Esprit de la Ligue. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1818. Davila: Storia delle Guerre Civili di Francia. 6 vols. in 7. London, 1801. Engl. transl. by Farneworth. 2 vols. 4to. London, 1801. Duncan (J.): Religious Wars in France, from the Accession of Henry II. to the Peace of Vervins. 12mo. London, 1840. Schiller (J. C. F. von): Gsch. d. Unruben in Frankreich welche d. Regierung Heinrich IV. vorangingen. 8vo. Stuttgart, 1844. S. Scott: Life of T. A. d'Aubigné: an Account of the Civil Wars, etc. 8vo. London, 1772. Voltaire: Essai sur les Guerres Civiles de France. 8vo. Paris, 1785. Pardoe (J.): The Court and Reign of Francis I. 2 vols. 12mo. Phil., 1847. Freer (M. W.): Court and Times of Henry III. 3 vols. 12mo. London, 1858. Bassompierre: Mém. de la Cour de France. 2 vols. in 1. 16mo. Cologne, 1666. Freer: History of the Reign of Henry IV. 2 vols. 12mo. London, 1860–63. G. P. R. James: Life of Henry IV. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1847. Maimbourg: Hist. de la Ligue. 4to. Paris, 1657. Weiss: Hist. des Réfug. Prot. de France [after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes]. 2 vols. Paris. 1853. Coquerel: Les Églises du Désert chez les Prot. de France [after Louis XIV.]. 2 vols. 8vo. 1841. Muret: Hist. de Jeanne d'Albret. Paris, 1861. Sir James Stephen: Lectures on the Hist. of France. 3d ed. 2 vols. 8vo. 1857. Laval: Hist. of the Ref. in France. 7 vols. 8vo. 1737 seq. Laurent: Guerres de Religion. Genin: Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême (1841); also, Nouvelles Lettres de la Reine de Navarre (1842). Stähelin: Der Uebertritt König Heinrichs d. vierten. 8vo. Basel, 1862. Wraxall: Memoirs of the Kings of the Race of Valois. 2 vols. 8vo. 1807; Hist. of France from the Accession of Henry III. to the Death of Louis XIV. 2d ed. 1814. 6 vols. 8vo. Reuchlin: Geschichte von Port Royal. 2 Bd. 1839 seq. Sainte-Beuve: Port Royal, 5 vols. 2d ed. 8vo. 1860. Le Saint-Barthélemy devant le Senat de Venise: relations des ambassadeurs. G. Michiel et S. Cavalli. Trad. et annot. par W. Martin. 18mo. 1872. E. Armstrong : The French Wars of Religion, London, 1892. H. Hauser: La propagation de la Réforme en France, Paris, 1894.

Lives of French Leaders. E. Marcks: Gaspard de Coligny, Stuttgart, 1892. A. de Ruble: Antoine de Bourbon et Jeanne d'Albret, Paris, 1881–82. F. Buisson: Sébastien Castellion, Paris, 1892. C. T. Atkinson : Michel de l'Hôpital, London, 1900. J. B. Perkins : Richelieu, New York, 1900. R. Lodge: Richelieu, London, 1896. E. Sichel: Catherine de Medici, New York, 1905.

The Reformation in the Netherlands

Gachard: Correspondance de Guillaume le Taciturne, Prince d'Orange, publiée pour la premiére fois, etc. 6 vols. 8vo. 1847–58. Also, by the same, Correspondance de Philippe II., sur les Affaires des Pays-Bas [from the Archives of Simancas]. 4 vols. 4to. 1848–59.

Groen van Prinsterer: Archives ou Correspondance inédite de al Maison d'Orange-Nassau [1552–1584]. 10 vols. 8vo. 1857–61. Le même: 2e seire [1584–1688]. 6 vols. 8vo. 1857–61.

Granvelle: Papiers d'État, d'après les Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de Besançon. 9 vols. 4to. 1841–61. In the Collection des Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France. Paris, 1835 seq.

Poullet and Piot: Correspondance du Cardinal Granvelle, Brussels, 1878–97. Kervyn de Lettenhove: Relations politiques des Pays-Bas et de l'Angleterre sous la règne de Philippe II., 5 vols., Brussels, 1882–86.

Documentos escorgidos del Archivio de la Casa de Alba, Madrid, 1891.

M. Nijhoff: Biblioteca Historico-Nederlandica (bibliographical), The Hague, 1898–99.

Brandt: Hist. der Reformatie in en omtrent de Nederlanden. Amst., 1693 seq. 4 vols. 4to. Engl. transl., London, 1720. 4 vols. Grotius: Annales et Hist. de Rebus Belgicis, 1556–1609. Gerdesius: Hist. Ref., etc. (See above.) Ypey en Dermout: Geschiedenissen der Nederland. hervormde Kerk. Breda, 1819–27. 4 vols. 8vo. Van Meteren: Hist. der Nederlanden, 1369–1612. Ter Har: Die Ref. Gsch. in Schilderungen. 8vo. A. Kökler: Die niederl. ref. Kirche. Erlangen, 1856. 8vo. G. Bentivoglio: Della Guerra di Fiandra [1559–1607]. Milano, 1806. Engl. transl. 4to. London, 1678. Strada: De Bello Belgico. 2 vols. Fol. 1640–47. Engl. transl. by Stapylton: Fol. London, 1650. Schiller: Abfall der Niederlande. 8vo. Stuttgart, 1844. Eng. transl., by Morison. 2 vols. 12mo. London, 1851. Van Kampen: Geschichte der Niederlande, 2 vols. 8vo. 1831–33. Motley: Rise of the Dutch Republic. 3 vols. 8vo. New York, 1856. History of the United Netherlands. 4 vols. 8vo. New York, 1861. Holzwarth: Der Abfall der Niederlande, 3 vols. 8vo. 1866–72. Prescott: History of Philip II. 3 vols. 8vo. 1855. Th. Juste: Hist. de la Révol. des Pays-Bas. sous Phil. II. (1555–72). 2 vols. 8vo. 1855; Hist. du soulèvement des Pays-Bas contre la domination espagnole (1572–76). 2 vols. 8vo. 1862–63; Les Pays-Bas sous Charles Quint — Vie de Marie de Hongrie (1505–58). 8vo. 1855. Basnage: Annales des Provinces-Unis (1719). H. Leo: Zwölf Bücher der neiderland Geschichte. 2 vols. 1832–45. Koch: Untersuchungen über die Empörung u. den Abfall d. Niederlande von Spanien. 1 vol. 8vo.

P. J. Blok: Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Volk. 3 vols. Groningen, 1892–96; English translation, New York, 1898–1900.

J. ten Brink: De eerste jaren der Nederlandsche Revolutie, Rotterdam, 1882. J. Reitsma: Geschidenis van de Hervorming en de hervorm de Kerk d. Nederlanden, Groningen, 1893.

E. Marx: Studien zur Geschichte der niederländischen Aufstandes. Leipzig, 1902.
P. J. Blok: Lodewijk van Nassau. The Hague, 1889.
F. Harrison: William the Silent. London, 1897.
R. Putnam: William the Silent. 2 vols. New York, 1898.
M. A. S. Hume: Philip II. of Spain. London, 1902.
The Bibliothica Reformationa Nierlandica, edited by Profs. Cranmer and Pyper, is being issued by Martinus Nijhoff of the Hague. Vol I., containing Schriften aus der Zeit der Reformation in den Niederlanden, appeared in 1903; and vol. ii., reproducing the Offer des Heeren of 1570, a collection of Letters and Songs of Mennonite Martyrs, was published in 1904.

The Reformation in England

Documents and Contemporary Sources. Works of the Reformers, published by the Parker Society, Cambridge, 1841–54 (54 vols., with a general index), comprising the writings of Ridley, Sandys, Pilkington, R. Hutchinson, Philpot, Grindal, T. Becon, Fulke, Hooper, Cranmer, Coverdale, Latimer, Jewel, Bradford, Whitgift; together with the Zurich Letters (1st and 2d series), Original Letters (2 vols.), The Correspondence of M. Parker, etc.
The State Calendars, now being published, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls.
Rymer: Fœdera, Conventiones, Literæ, etc., inter Reges Angliæ et al. Reges, Pontifices, etc. 3d ed. 10 vols. Fol. 1739–45.
Rushworth: Historical Collections (1618–1648). 8 vols. Fol. London, 1721.
Fox: Acts and Monuments of the Church, or Book of Martyrs, 1563. Fol. 1684. 3 vols. Fol. 1837–41. 8 vols. 8vo.
Ellis: Letters illustrative of English History. 1st series. 3 vols. 8vo. 1824; 2d series. 4 vols. 8vo. 1827. 3d series. 4 vols.
Wilkins: Concilia Magnæ Brittaniæ et Hiberniæ (446–1717). 4 vols. Fol. 1736–7.
E. Cardwell: Documentary Annals of the Church of England (1546–1716). 2 vols. 8vo. Oxford, 1844. By the same: Synodalia. 1547–1717 (relating to the province of Canterbury). 2 vols. 8vo. Oxford, 1842. By the same: The Reformation of the Laws as attempted in the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth. New ed. Oxford, 1850.
Formularies of Faith put forth under the reign of Henry VIII. Oxford, 1856. 8vo.
W. Maskell: Monumenta Ritualia Eccl. Anglicanæ. 3 vols. 8vo. 1846–7.
Holinshed: Chronicle of Englande, Scotlande, and Ireland, 1577. 2 vols. Fol. 1807–8. 6 vols. 4to.
Gee and Hardy: Documents illustrative of English Church History, London, 1896.

G. W. Prothero: Select Statutes and Other Constitutional Documents illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. 2d ed., Oxford, 1898.

S. R. Gardiner: Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution. 2d ed., Oxford, 1899.

W. Stubbs: Collation of the Journals of the Lords, with the Records of Convocation, 1529 to 1547; and The High Commission Court (Appendices I. and IV., to the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, in Vol. XXIV. of Parliamentary Reports for 1883).

S. Ehses: Römische Dokumente zur Geschichte der Ehesheidung Heinrich VIII. Paderborn, 1893.

General Histories. By Ranke: Engl. Geschichte vornehmlich im siebzehnten Jahrh. 9 vols. 8vo. Leipzig, 1870. By Carte (to 1654), 1747 seq.; by Kennet (to the death of William III.), 3 vols., fol. 1719; by Macaulay (from the accession of James I., with a hist. Introduct. 5 vols. 8vo. 1849 seq.). Macaulay's introductory chapter includes a brief account of the rise and character of Protestantism in Great Britain. His Reviews of Ranke and of Hallam (in his collected Essays) relate in part to the Reformation. By Mackintosh (to the 14th year of Elizabeth's reign; continued by W. Wallace, and then by R. Bell); 10 vols. 12mo. 1838. By Hume. Hume's negligence in examining and reporting authorities, his inaccuracy, his partiality for the Stuarts, and his frigid tone with regard to questions of morals and religion, are now conceded; as are, also, the excellence of his style, and his sagacity as an economist. By Lingard (Roman Catholic). Lingard is an able and well-informed writer, but with strong Anti-Protestant prejudices. By Knight, 8 vols., 8vo, 1868; by T. Keightley, 3 vols., 8vo, 1839; by J. Miller (to 1688), 4th ed., 4to, London, 1818; by Turner (to the death of Elizabeth), 12 vols., 8vo, 1839; by Froude (from the Fall of Wolsey to the defeat of the Spanish Armada), 12 vols., 8vo, New York, 1865 seq.; by F. L. G. Raumer: Political History of England during the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, 2 vols., 8vo, London, 1836; by Oldmixon: History of England during the Reign of the Stuarts, 2 vols., fol., London, 1730; by Vaughan; History of England under the House of Stuart (1603–1688), 2 vols., 8vo, London, 1840; by the same: Memorials of the Stuart Dynasty, 2 vols., 8vo, London, 1831; by Clarendon: Hist. of the Great Rebellion (1641–60), 3 vols., fol., Oxford, 1702–4. By F. S. Thomas: Historical Notes relative to the History of England, from the accession of Henry VIII. to the death of Anne (1509–1714), designed as a book of instant reference to dates. 3 vols. 8vo. 1858. Camden: Annales Rerum Anglic. et Hibernic. regnante Elizabetha (to 1589) 1615 seq. 1717. 3 vols. 8vo. Oxford. Life of Col. Hutchinson, by his wife, ed. by Firth. 1885. 2 vols. Pepys: Diary and Correspondence. Evelyn: Diary (from 1641–1705–6), 4 vols. 8vo. 1854. Ed. Bray; new ed. with life by Wheatley. 4 vols. 1879. Harris: Lives of James I., Charles I., Cromwell, Charles II. 5 vols. 8vo.

1814. Godwin, History of the Commonwealth. 4 vols. 8vo. 1824–28. R. Vaughan: the Protectorate of Cromwell. 2 vols. 8vo. 1839. Buckle: Hist. of Civilization in England, new ed. 3 vols. 8vo. 1867. Strickland: Lives of the Queens of England. 8 vols. 8vo. 1850–54; new ed. 12mo, 1865. Lives of the Queens of Scotland, 8 vols. 8vo. 1850–59.

Hallam: Const. History of England. 3 vols. 8vo. 1867. This is the most successful of Hallam's historical writings. It is thorough and impartial in its treatment of religious parties and persons, and specially instructive on the legal and constitutional questions involved in the history of the Reformation.

J. S. Brewer: The Reign of Henry VIII. 2 vols., London, 1884.

A. F. Pollard: Henry VIII. London, 1902.

A. F. Pollard: England under Protector Somerset. London, 1900.

R. B. Merriman: Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell. 2 vols., Oxford, 1902.

M. Creighton: Cardinal Wolsey. London, 1888.

J. M. Stone: History of Mary I., Queen of England. London, 1901.

E. S. Beesley: Queen Elizabeth. London, 1892.

M. Creighton: Queen Elizabeth. London, 1896.

M. A. S. Hume: The Great Lord Burghley, London, 1898.

S. R. Gardiner: History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War. 10 vols., London, 1887. History of the Great Civil War. 3 vols., London, 1886–91, etc.

Carlyle: Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches: with elucidations by T. Carlyle. 2 vols. New York, 1845. With notes, supplement, etc. 3 vols. London, 1904. 2 vols. 8vo. New York, 1845. This contributed more than any other work to raise the reputation of Cromwell in recent times, and to vindicate him against the imputation of insincerity.

C. H. Frith: Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England. New York, 1900.

J. Morley: Oliver Cromwell. New York, 1900.

H. A. Glass: The Barebone Parliament. London, 1899.

Histories of the English Reformation. Burnet: The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. London, 1679 seq. 7 vols., 1829. 8vo. Ed. by Pocock. 7 vols., 1865.

Burnet is an honest writer, with extraordinary means of knowledge, but sometimes swayed by prejudice. "It is usual," says Macaulay (Hist. of Engl., i. 163), "to censure Burnet as a singularly inaccurate historian, but I believe the charge to be altogether unjust. He appears to be singularly inaccurate only because his narrative has been subjected to a scrutiny singularly severe and unfriendly."

Strype: Ecclesiastical Memorials relating chiefly to Religion and the Reformation of it, and the Emergencies of the Church of England under King Henry VIII., King Edward VI., and Queen Mary. 3 vols. London, 2d ed., 1745–37. Brief Annals of the Church and State, under the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. London, 2d ed., 1738.

Fol. The Complete Works of Strype. 27 vols. 8vo. Oxford, 1821–40.

Strype is the authority most frequently consulted and quoted in works on the English Reformation. He is a veracious writer; his own statements are instructive and valuable, and the documents which he publishes are still more so. Occasional inaccuracies in copying citations, arising from a want of care, do not essentially detract from his merit. On these inaccuracies, pointed out by Maitland, see the London Athenæum, 1858, i. 404.

J. Collier (a non-juring Bishop): Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, to the death of Charles II. 2 vols. Fol. London, 1708–14. 9 vols. 8vo. 1846. Dodd (Roman Catholic), in his Church History of England (1500–1688). 3 vols. Fol. 1737 seq.: new ed., 1839 seq. Dodd's work was designed as an antidote to Burnet. H. Soames: History of the Reformation of the Church of England. 4 vols. 8vo. 1826–27; by the same: Elizabethan Church History, London, 1848, 8vo. By J. V. Short: Sketch of the History of Church of England to the Revolution of 1688. 2 vols. 8vo. 1832: 8th ed., 1870. By F. C. Massingberd: History of the English Reformation, 4th ed., 1867, 8vo. J. H. Blunt: History of the Reformation to the death of Wolsey (1514–47). 8vo. London. 1872. I. J. Blunt: Sketch of the Reformation in England. 26th ed. 1869. J. A. Baxter: Church History of England. 2d ed. London, 1849. 8vo. By Peter Heylin: History of the Reformation of the Church of England. Fol. 1661 seq. Carwithen: History of the Church of England. 2 vols. 2d ed. Oxford, 1849. 8vo. Neal: History of the Puritans from the Reformation to the death of Queen Elizabeth, 1732 seq. 4 vols. 8vo; Toulmin's ed., 1793 seq., 5 vols., 8vo; Choules's Am. ed., 2 vols., 8vo, New York, 1844. J. B. Marsden: History of Earlier and Later Puritans. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1852. S. Hopkins: The Puritans. 3 vols. Boston, 1859–60. S. R. Maitland: Essays on Subjects connected with the British Reformation. 1849. 8vo. Fuller: Church History of Britain from the Time of Christ to 1648. Fol. 1655. 6 vols. 8vo. London, 1845. Lathbury: History of the Nonjurors. 8vo. 1845. T. Lathbury: History of English Episcopacy, from the Long Parliament to the Act of Uniformity. 8vo. London, 1836. Brennan: Ecclesiastica. History of Ireland to 1829. 2 vols. 8vo. Dublin, 1848. R. Mant: History of the Church of Ireland from the Reformation to the Revolution. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1841. Rees: History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales. 8vo. 1861. Hardwick: History of Articles of Religion. New ed. 1859. 8vo. T. Lathbury: History of the Book of Common Prayer. 2d ed. 1858. W. Keeling: Liturgiæ Brittanicæ. 8vo. 2d ed. 1851. W. Palmer: Origines Liturgicæ. 4th ed. 2 vols. 8vo. 1845. Tulloch: English Puritanism and its Leaders: Cromwell, Milton, Baxter, Bunyan. 8vo. London, 1861. Fletcher: History of the Independents. 4 vols. 12mo. 1862. Hook: Lives of the Archbishops of

Canterbury. New series. 3 vols. (Vol. 8. Ref. period. 1869. 8vo.) STOUGHTON: Ecclesiastical History of England [Civil Wars, Commonwealth, Restoration]. 4 vols. 8vo. 1867–70. Hanbury: Ecclesiastical Memorials relative to the Independents. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1839. J. Waddington: Congregational Church History from the Reformation to 1662. London, 1862. HUNT: History of Religious Thought in England. 8vo. Vol. i., 1870. Vol. ii., 1871. J. Waterworth: Historical Lectures on the Reformation in England.

F. MAKOWER: Constitutional History and Constitution of the Church of England, translated from the German. London, 1905.

PROCTOR AND FRERE: A new History of the Book of Common Prayer. London, 1901.

R. W. Dixon: History of the Church of England. 2d ed., London, 1893.

J. H. Blunt: The Reformation of the Church of England. London, 1896.

J. GAIRDNER: The English Church in the Sixteenth Century. London, 1902.

W. H. FRERE: The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. London, 1904.

W. H. HUTTON: The English Church from the Accession of Charles I. to the death of Anne. London, 1903.

F. A. Gasquet: Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries. London, 1888. The Eve of the Reformation. London, 1900. Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer. London, 1890.

H. GEE: The Elizabethan Clergy. Oxford, 1898.

E. L. Taunton: The History of the Jesuits in England, 1580–1773.

W. A. SHAW: A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth. London, 1900.

J. H. Overton: Life in the English Church, 1660–1714. London, 1885.

H. M. DEXTER: The Congregationalism of the Last 300 Years as seen in its Literature. New York, 1880.

E. Arber: The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers. London, 1897.

M. DEXTER: The England and Holland of the Pilgrims. Boston, 1905.

Biographies. STRYPE: Lives of Cranmer, Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, Aylmer, Cheke, and Smith. W. Gilpin: Life of Cranmer. 1784. 8vo. Lives of the Reformers. 1809. 2 vols. 8vo. Todd: Life of Cranmer, 1831. Le Bas: Life of Jewel. 8vo. 1835. Life of Laud. 8vo. 1836. C. Wordsworth: Eccl. Biography, or Lives of Eminent Men in England, from the Commencement of the Ref. to the Revolution. 4th ed. 4 vols. 8vo. 1853. B. F. Tytler. Life of Henry VIII. 12mo. New ed. 1851. Lord Herbert. Life and Reign of Henry VIII. Fol. 1649 seq. 1770. 4to. Fiddes. Life of Wolsey, 4 vols. 8vo. 1742. F. Seebohm: The Oxford Reformers. 3d ed., London, 1896.

A. F. POLLARD: Thomas Cranmer. New York, 1904. T. E. Bridgett: Life and Writings of Thomas More. London, 1891. W. H. Hutton: Sir Thomas More. London, 1895. F. G. Lee: Reginald Pole. London, 1888. W. H. Hutton: William Laud. London, 1895. P. Lorimer:

John Knox and the Church of England. London, 1875. F. J. Powicke: Henry Barrow, Separatist. London, 1900.

THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND. *Contemporary Sources*

WODROW SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS. 24 vols. 8vo. Comprising Calderwood's Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland, 8 vols.; Autobiography of Robert Blair (from 1593–1636); Scott's Apologetical Narration (from 1560–1633); Twedie's Select Biographies, 2 vols. and other works.

SPOTTISWOODE SOCIETY PUBLICATIONS. 16 vols. 8vo. Comprising Keith's History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland from the Beginning of the Ref. to 1568; The Spottiswoode Miscellany (2 vols.), etc.

JOHN KNOX: Historie of the Reformation of Religioun within the Realme of Scotland, in V Books; with his life by David Buchanan. Edinb. 1584. Ed. by David Laing (with other writings of Knox), 1846 seq. 4 vols. 8vo.

Bannatyne [Secretary of Knox]: Journal of Transactions, etc. 1570–73. Edinb. 1806.

Spottiswoode: History of the Church of Scotland. 8vo. 3 vols. (by the Wodrow Soc.).

Labanoff: Lettres, Instructions, et Mémoires de Marie Stuart, etc. 7 vols. 8vo. London, 1844.

A. Teulet: Lettres de Marie Stuart, publiées avec sommaires, etc. 8vo. 1859.

A. Teulet: Relations Politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Écosse en 16e Siècle. Papiers d'État, etc. 5 vols. Paris, 1862.

G. Buchanan: Rerum Scotic. Hist. Edinb., 1582. Fol. In English, 1690. Fol.

R. Baillie: Letters and Journals [on the period from 1637–1662], new ed. 3 vols. 8vo. Edinb., 1841–2.

Sir James Balfour: Annales (1057–1640), and Memorials and Passages of Church and State (1641–1652). 4 vols. Edinb., 1824.

J. Lesly (Bp. of Ross): A Defence of the Honor of Mary, Queen of Scotland. London, 1569. 8vo. 1570. 8vo.

G. Buchanan: A Detection of the Doings of Mary, Queen of Scots, etc. Circa, 1572.

Register of the Privy Council of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1877.

State Papers, Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, Calendar. Edinburgh, 1898, 1903.

Accounts and Papers relating to Mary, Queen of Scots, Camden Society. London, 1867.

J. Pollen: Despatches of Papal Envoys to Queen Mary. Edinburgh, 1900.

W. Forbes-Leith: Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart. Edinburgh, 1885.

J. Scott: Bibliography of Works relating to Mary, Queen of Scots. Edinburgh, 1896.

Later Works. W. ROBERTSON: History of Scotland during the reigns of Mary and James VI., etc. (in numerous editions). G. Stuart: Hist. of the Establishment of the Ref. of Rel. in Scotland (1517–1561). 4to. London, 1780. Hist. of Scotland from the Establ. of the Ref. to the Death of Mary. 2 vols. 4to. London, 1782. W. M. Hetherington: Hist. of the Church of Scotland (new ed.). 2 vols. 8vo. 1853. T. McCRIE: Life of Andrew Melville. 2 vols. 8vo. 1819. 2d ed. London. 1847. 8vo. T. McCrie, Jr.: Sketches of Scottish Church History. 2d ed. 1843. 8vo. A. Stevenson: History of the Ch. and State of Scotland from the Accession of Charles I. to the Restoration. 1844. 8vo. J. Cunningham: Ch. Hist. of Scotland to the Present Time. 2 vols. 8vo. 1859. LEE: Lectures on the Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland. 2 vols. 8vo. Edinb., 1860. J. Scott: Lives of the Reformers in Scotland. Edinb., 1810. Von Rudloff: Gsch. d. Ref. in Schottland. 2 Th. Berlin, 1849. A. Gamberg: Die schottische nat. Kirche. Hamb., 1827. K. H. Sack: Die evang. Kirche Schottlands. Heidelb., 1844. G. Cook: Hist. of the Ref. in Scotland. 3 vols. Edinb., 1811. BURTON: Hist. of Scotland to 1688. 7 vols. Lond., 1867–70; 1689–1748. 2 vols. 1870. P. F. Tytler: History of Scotland [1149–1603], new ed. 10 vols. 8vo. 1866. Laing: Hist. of Scotland from the Accession of James I. to the Reign of Queene Anne. 1819. 4 vols. 8vo. Lawson: The Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution. 2 vols. 8vo. 1844. Mignet: Histoire de Marie Stuart. 2 vols. 12mo. Paris, 1854. W. Tytler: Inquiry, Historical and Critical, into the Evidence against Mary, Queen of Scots, etc. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1790. J. Hosack: Mary, Queen of Scots and her Accusers. 2d ed. 2 vols. 8vo. 1870. Leland: History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II. to 1688. 3 vols. 4to. 1773.

M. Philippson: Marie Stuart et la Ligue Catholique universelle. Brussels, 1886. Histoire du Règne de Marie Stuart. 3 vols., Paris, 1891–92.

A. LANG: A History of Scotland. 3 vols., London, 1900–04.

P. H. Brown: History of Scotland. Cambridge, 1902.

J. Skelton: The Life of Mary Stuart. London, 1893. A. Lang: The Mystery of Mary Stuart. London, 1901.

M. Philippson: Les Lettres de la Casette, in the Revue Historique. Paris, 1887. B. Sepp: Der Originaltext der Cassettenbriefe. Munich, 1888. T. F. Henderson: The Casket Letters. Edinburgh, 1890. S. Cowan: Mary, Queen of Scots, and who wrote the Casket Letters? London, 1901.

Lives of Knox. T. McCRIE: Life of John Knox, 1812. New edition, 1854, and (edited by A. Crichton), Belfast, 1874. P. Lorimer: John Knox and the Church of England. London, 1875. F. Brander: John Knox. Elberfeld, 1862. P. H. BROWN: John Knox. London, 1895. A. LANG: John Knox and the Reformation. London, 1905. Henry Cowan: John Knox. New York, 1905.

The Reformation in Italy

Gerdesius: Specimen Italiæ Ref. Lugd. Bat., 1765. 4to.
McCrie: Hist. of the Ref. in Italy. 8vo. 1827. New ed. 1855. D. Erdmann: Die Ref. u. ihre Märtyrer in Italien. Berlin, 1855. Jules Bonnet: Vie de Olympia Morata. 4me ed. Paris, 1865. Muratori: Annali d'Italia, dal Principio dell' Era volgare fino all anno 1750. 12 vols. 8vo. Rome, 1752–54. Guicciardini: Storia d'Italia. 10 vols. Pisa, 1819–20. Hübner: Life of Sixtus V. 2 vols. 8vo. 1872. Brieger: Gaspar Contarini [on the Ratisbon Conference]. Gotha, 1870. M. Young: Life of Paleario. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1860. Sixt: Petrus Paulus Vergerius, päpstlicher Nuntius, etc. 1855. J. Bonnet: Aonio Paleario, Étude sur la Réforme en Italie. 12mo. 1862. Roscoe: Life of Leo X. 6th ed. 2 vols. 8vo. 1846. Audin: Histoire de Léon X. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris. 3d ed. 2 vols. 8vo. 1851.
K. Benrath: Über die Quellen der italianischen Reformationsgeschichte. Bonn, 1876. Bernadino Ochino. Leipzig, 1875. Geschichte der Reformation in Venedig. Halle, 1887.
E. Comba: I Nostri Protestanti. Florence, 1881, 1897. M. Carrasco: Alfonso et Juan de Valdés. Geneva, 1880. B. Fontana: Renata di Francia. Rome, 1889–99. W. Braun: Gasparo Contarini, 1903.

The Reformation in Spain

Reformistas Antiguos Españoles. 20 vols. 8vo. London and Madrid, 1848–63. This collection of the writings of Spanish Protestants was printed at the cost of B. B. Wiffen. It may be found in the Boston Public Lib.; also in the Library of Harvard College.
A. F. Büsching: Comm. de Vestigiis Lutheranismi in Hispania. Göttingen, 1755. 4to. McCrie: Hist. of the Ref. in Spain. 8vo. 1829. New ed. 1855. De Castros: The Spanish Prot. and their Suppression by Philip II. Translated by T. Parker. London, 1851. Sanctæ Inquisitionis Artes aliquot detectæ: R. G. Montano auctore. Heidelb. 1567. Mariana: Hist. General de España, 18 vols. Valencia, 1830–41. 2 vols. 8vo. Madrid, 1854 (in the Bibl. de Autores Españoles, vols. 19–20), Engl. transl. 1699. R. St. Hilaire, Histoire d'Espagne. Tom. xii. New ed. 1844 seq. Dunham: Hist. of Spain and Portugal. New ed. 3 vols. 12mo. 1847. Prescott: History of the Reign of Philip II. 3 vols. 8vo. 1855. Ticknor: Hist. of Spanish Literature. 3 vols. 8vo. 3d ed. Book, 1866. Llorente: Hist. de l'Inquisition d'Espagne. 4 vols. Paris. 1820.
E. Boehmer: Spanish Reformers of Two Centuries from 1520. 2 vols., Strassburg and London, 1874, 1883. J. Lasalle: La Réforme en Espagne, au 16me siècle. Paris, 1883. E. Christ: Spanische Glaubenschelden. Basel, 1886. C. A. Wilkens: Geschichte des spanischen Protestantismus. Gütersloh, 1888.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC COUNTER-REFORMATION

W. MAURENBRECHER: Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation. Nördlingen, 1880. M. Philippson: La Contre-révolution religieuse au 16me siècle. Brussels, 1884. A. W. Ward: The Counter-Reformation. London, 1888. A. R. Pennington. The Counter-Reformation in Europe. London, 1899.

I. *The Council of Trent. Sources.* J. le Plat (teacher of Canon Law at Louvain): Monumentorum ad Hist. Concil. Trid. Spectantium Amplissima Collectio. Louvain, 1781 seq. 7 (8) tom. 4to.

Acta Conc. Trid. ann. 1562–63 a Cardinale Paleotto descripta; ed. Mendham, London, 1842.

Lettres et Mémoires de François de Vargas, de Pierie de Malvenda [members of the Imperial embassy], et de quelques Evêques d'Espagne, touchant le Conc. de Trente. Paris, 1654. 4to.

Mendham: Memoirs of the Council of Trent. 8vo. London, 1834. New ed. 1844.

Planck: Anecdota ad Hist. Conc. Trid. Pertinentia. Göttingen, 1791–1818, 26 programmata.

Köllner: De actis Concil. trid. Göttingen. 2 part. 8vo. 1841.

Sickel: Zur Geschichte d. Concil. von Trient; Acten-stucke aus Oesterreichischen Archiven. Vienna, 1872.

Canones et Decreta Conc. Trid., juxta Exemplar authentic. Romæ editum, ed. le Plat, Antwerp, 1779. 4to. Madrid, 1786. Fol. New ed., enlarged from the Rom. Bullarium, by A. L. Richter, Leipzig, 1853.

LIBRI SYMBOLICI ECCL. CATHOL., edd. Streitwolf and Klener, Göttingen, 1838. 2 vols. 8vo.

P. Schaff: Creeds of Christendom, Vol. II. New York, 1877.

Histories of the Council of Trent. PAOLO SARPI: Istoria del Conc. Trident., London, 1619, fol.; in Latin, London, 1620; Engl. translation by Brent, 1676, fol. French ed., with notes by Le Courayer, London, 2 tom., folio, 1736.

SFORZA PALLAVICINO: Istoria del Conc. di Trento. Roma, 1656–7. 2 t., fol.: 2d ed., 3 t., 4to, 1665: in Latin, Giattino, Rom. and Antvp., 1672, 3 t., 4to; new ed. revised by the author, Rome, 1666.

Biografia di Frà Paolo Sarpi di Bianchi-Giovini. Zurigo, 1836, 2 t. E. Munch: Frà P. Sarpi, Carlsruhe, 1838.

Wessenberg [Roman Catholic]: Die grossen Kirchenversammlungen der 15. u. 16. Jahrh. 4 vols. Constance, 1840.

Courayer: Discours Hist. sur la Réception du Concile de Trente. Amsterdam, 1756 (appendix to Sarpi). Bungener: Hist. du Concile de Trente. 2 vols. 12mo. 1853.

F. Baguenault de Purchesse: Histoire du Concile de Trent. Paris, 1870.

Vermeulen: Die Verlegung des Konzil von Trent. Regensburg, 1890–92.

J. A. Froude: Lectures on the Council of Trent. London, 1896.

The Popes of this Period. RANKE: History of the Popes. 3 vols. 8vo. 1867.

Lorentz: Sixtus V. u. seine Zeit. Mayence, 1852.

Hübner: Life of Pope Sixtus V. Engl. transl. 2 vols. 8vo. 1872.

II. *The Order of Jesuits.* Corpus Institutorum Societatis Jesu. Antvp., 1702. 2 vols. 4to.

Constitutiones, Decreta Congregationum, Censuræ et Præcepta, cum Litteris Apostol. et Privilegiis. Prague, 1755. 2 vols. 4to. Institutum soc. Jesu. Prague, 1757. Fol.

Monumenta historica Societatis Jesu nunc primum edita. Madrid, 1894 seq.

Lives of Ignatius Loyola: Consalvi, in Acta Sanctorum, Jul. vii. 634 seq.; by Ribadeneira, Naples, 1572, Madrid, 1586, and in Acta Sanct. l. c. 655 seq.; by Maffei, Rome, 1585; by Bartoli, Rome, 1659. Genelli: Leben d. heilig. Loyola. Innsbruck, 1848, I. Taylor; Loyola and Jesuitism in its Rudiments. 8vo. London. 1849. E. Gothein: Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation. Halle, 1895.

Exercitia Spiritualia Ign. Loiolæ, Antvp., 1638, Ratisbon, 1855. History of the Jesuit Order, by Hasenmuller, 1588; by Gretser, Ingolstadt, 1584; by R. Hospinian, Zurich (1649), 1670. Hist. d. Religieux de la Compagnie de Jésus, Paris, 1740, Utrecht, 1741. 4to. 4 tom.

Harenberg: Pragm. Gsch. d. Ordens d. Jesuiten. Halle, 1760. 2 vols. 4to. [Goudrette:] Hist. Générale de la Naissance et des Progrès de la Compagnie de Jésus; et [C. Paige] l'Analyse de ses Constitutions et Priviléges. Paris, 1760. Amst., 1761, 5 vols. Wolf: Allg. Gsch. d. Jesuiten. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1803.

Histories of the Jesuits, by Dallas, 2 vols. London, 1816; by Liskenne, Paris, 1825; by De Sarrion, Paris, 1838; by Crétineau Joly, Paris, 1844–6, 6 tomes; by Brühl, Würzburg, 1845 seq.; by Buss, Mayence, 2 abth., 1853; by Stöger, Ratisbon, 1851; by Kortum, Mannheim, 1843; by Julius, Leipzig, 1845 seq.; by Steinmetz, London, 1848. 3 vols. 8vo.

For the multitudinous works respecting the Jesuits, reference must be had to the special bibliographies:—

Carayon: Bibl. historique de la Compagnie de Jésus, ou Catalogue des ouvrages relatifs à l'histoire des Jésuites depuis leur origine, etc. 4to. 1864.

Bibliothèque des Écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus, ou Notices bibliographiques 1° De tous les ouvrages publiés par les Membres de la Compagnie de Jésus; 2° Des Apologies, des Controverses religieuses, des Critiques littéraires et scientifiques suscitées à leur sujet. Par Augustin et Alois de Backer, Série i.–vii., 1853–61. Of this work, Petzholdt (*Bibliothec. bibliograph*, 1866), after referring to the previous bibliographical labors of Ribadeneira, Alegambe, and Southwell, says: "Alles was von Jesuiten-bibliographie bisher erschienen ist, wird durch das B.'sche Werk durchaus überflüssig gemacht."

INDEX

Academies, the Italian, broken up by the Inquisition, 343.
"Acceptants," 382.
Adiaphoristic controversy, 144.
Adrian VI., Pope, on the corruption of the church, 11; his character, 101; reply of the Diet of Nuremberg (1522) to his demand for action against Luther, 101; his letter to Zwingli, 128.
Æsop, Luther translates, 106.
Aix la Chapelle, Peace of, 384.
Albigenses, their character, 46; crusades of Innocent III. against them, 46.
Alciati, 402.
Aleander, 94.
Alençon, Duke of (husband of Margaret), 213.
Alençon, Duke of (Duke of Anjou), his death, 240.
Alexander III., his interview with Frederic Barbarossa, 24.
Alexander V., Pope, his pledges to the council of Pisa, 35.
Alexander VI., Pope, his grant to Spain, 40; his character, 37; excommunicates Savonarola, 53.
Alexander of Hales, his doctrine of supererogatory merits, 79.
Allen, William, 351, 425.
Alphonso, king of Portugal, 39.
Altieri, 334.
Alva, Duke of, at the conference of Bayonne, 233; his character, 258; his recommendations to Philip II., 258; sent to the Netherlands, 258; marches from Italy, 258; establishes the "Council of Blood," 259; executes Egmont and Horn, 260; his scheme of taxation, 260; resigns, 261.
Amboise, conspiracy of, 225; avenged by Guise, 225; edict of, 232.
Anabaptists, their tenets, 400; different classes of, 401; numerous in the Netherlands, 266; influence of Menno on them, 266.
Anderson, Lawrence, 153.
Anglo-Saxons, their conversion, 19.
Anne Boleyn, her return to England, 213; her marriage with Henry VIII., 273.
Anquetil, on Catharine de Medici, 222.
Anselm, element of mysticism in, 54; his doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, 388.
Anthony of Navarre, summoned to Orleans, 226; made lieutenant-general, 227.
Antitrinitarians, rise of the, 401.
Aquinas, his doctrine of indulgences, 79; of supererogatory merits, 80; on the infallibility of the Pope, 25.
Arianism, its prevalence among the barbarian nations, 18; supplanted by Catholicism, 18.
Aristotle, connection of scholasticism with, 451; his authority shaken by the Humanists, 451; how far attacked by the reformers, 451; by Luther, 451; Melancthon's view of, 451; retained his place in Catholic universities, 452.
Armies, constitution of in the seventeenth century, 360.
Arminians, their doctrines, 398; their scholarship, 400; their political difference with the Calvinists, 269; their critical spirit, 458.
Arminius, his history, 398; his controversy with Gomarus, 398; Milton's remark on, 444.
Arnauld, 381, 447.
Arneys, Antoine, 198.
Arnold, of Brescia, his aim and fate, 328.
Arnold, T., on Church and State, 421.
Arran, Earl of, 300.
Art, how affected by Protestantism, 454; in the Netherlands, 455.
Articles, the ten, 275; they offend the Catholic party, 276; the six, 276.
Articles, of the Church of England, framed, 278; revision of (1563), 282.
Articles, the Lambeth, 289.
Asceticism, its origin in the Church, 464; in the Middle Ages, 464; cast away by Protestantism, 464.

Astrology, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, 2.
Atonement, Protestant and Catholic view of, 388; the theory of Grotius, 399.
Augsburg, Diet at (1530), 104; its decree, 105.
Augsburg, Confession of, 105; Apology for the Confession, 105.
Augsburg, peace of, 146; wholesome effect of it, 357; violations of it, 364.
Augustine, on religious persecution, 194; he is studied by Luther, 77; how he differs from Calvin, 287.
Austria, spread of Protestantism in, 357; Jesuit influence in, 357.
Autos da fé, in Spain, 346.
Avignon, residence of the popes at, 32; character of their court, 32.

Babylonian captivity of the Papacy, 32.
Bacon, Leonard, his Historical Discourses, 372.
Bacon, Lord, his view of astrology, 3; on the Puritan controversy, 297; on episcopacy, 285; on church government, 298; relation of his system to Protestantism, 452.
Bajus, 380.
Balmes, his view of the Reformation, 5.
Baltimore, Lord, 428.
Barneveldt, Olden, 399.
Baronius, 21; his annals, 440.
Basel, council of, 43; it hears the Utraquists, 157; Reformation established in, 125.
Baur, F. C., 459; on Servetus, 202.
Baxter, Richard, 369; his character, 373; ejected from his parish (1662), 373.
Bayle, on Leo X., 38.
Bayonne, conference at, 233.
Beaton, Cardinal, 300.
Beda, the Syndic, 210.
Beghards, who they were, 47.
Beguines, who they were, 47.
Bellarmine, on the corruption of the Church, 11; on the visible Church, 392; on Church and State, 425.
Bembo, Cardinal, his spirit, 62.
Berengarius, 129.
Bernard, St., mysticism of, 54.
Bernard, of Weimar, 364.
Berne, Reformation, established in, 125.
Berquin, Louis de, 214.
Berthelier, 200; put to death, 182.
Beveridge, 376.
Beza, Theodore; his character and manners, 229; at the Colloquy of Poissy, 229; on Calvin's death, 206; his remark on the death of Francis II., 227; on the origin of the word "Huguenot," 227.
Bible, the source of Protestantism, 8; Luther's translation of the, 99; its benefit to the Germans, 99; early German translations of the, 99; published in English by Henry VIII., 275; made by the Protestants the rule of faith, 389; effect of it in Protestant countries, 446; the reading of it not encouraged in the Catholic Church, 446; origin of the disuse of it among the laity, 447.
Biel, Gabriel, 393.
Blandrata, 402.
Blois, meeting of the States-General at (1576), 239; (1588), 240.
Boccaccio, his relation to the revival of learning, 58; his treatment of the Church and religion, 330.
Bodin, 3.
Bohemia, how affected by the execution of Huss, 154; its conversion to Christianity, 155; its sufferings after the Smalcaldic war, 159; Protestants acquire legal protection in, 159; reception of Luther's doctrine in, 158; its revolt against Ferdinand II., 358; gives its crown to the Elector Palatine, 359; devastated, 359.
Bologna, Protestantism in, 333.
Bolsec, imprisoned at Geneva, 187; banished, 196.
Bonaventura, mysticism of, 54.
Boniface, the apostle of Germany, 19.
Boniface VIII., his theories and character, 30; opposed by the spirit of nationalism, 31; his conflict with Philip the Fair, 31; his bull, *clericus laicos*, 31; is assaulted and dies, 32; how viewed by Tosti, Wiseman, and Schwab, 30.
Books, censorship of, in the Roman Catholic Church, 443; in Protestant countries, 444; by Laud, 444; by the Puritans, 445.
Bora, Catharine von, her marriage with Luther, 108.
Borromeo, Carlo, his character, 350.
Bossuet, 442, 454; refers the Reformation to a dispute of monks, 3; on the relation of Protestantism to abuses in the Church, 11; on the corruption of the Church, 11; his opinion of Calvin's intellect, 181; his correspondence with Molanus, 407; with Leibnitz, 407.
Bothwell, Mary's attachment to him, 305; his agency in Darnley's murder,

318; his abduction of the queen, 318; his supper at Edinburgh, 318; his divorce from his wife, 319; his marriage with Mary, 319.
Boucher, Jean, 401.
Bourbons, their union with the Huguenots, 223.
Bradford on predestination, 286.
Brantome, on Guise and Coligni, 225; admires Mary Queen of Scots, 304.
Breda, declaration of Charles II. from, 372.
Brederode, 255.
Bres, Guido de, 266.
Brethren in Unity, the Bohemian, rise of, 158; their reception of Luther's doctrine, 158.
Briçonnet, his reformatory tendencies, 211; opposes Protestantism, 211.
Briel, capture of, 260.
Brucioli, 333.
Bruno, Giordano, 440.
Bryce, his work on the "Holy Roman Empire," 21.
Bucer, Martin, his irenical efforts, 132; a professor at Cambridge, 278; on ceremonies in the English Church, 293; his letter to the Protestants of Bologna, 334.
Buchanan, George, 301.
Budæus, 210; Erasmus compared with, 66.
Bugenhagen, shapes the church constitution of Denmark, 150.
Bullinger, on the execution of Servetus, 202; his intimacy with English divines, 284.
Burckhardt, on the tone of the Italian Renaissance, 331.
Burleigh, his belief in astrology, 2.
Burnet, for comprehension, 376.
Burns, 446.

Cajetan, his interviews with Luther at Augsburg, 83.
Calderon, 438.
Calixtus, his syncretism, 405.
Calixtus II., Pope, concludes the Worms Concordat with Henry V., 24.
Calmar, Union of, 148.
Calvin, his birth, 166; belongs to the second generation of Reformers, 166; his childhood, 166; his father, 166; studies at Paris, 167; studies law at Orleans and Bourges, 167; his proficiency, 167; his habits of study, 167; learns Greek, 168; edits Seneca's treatise on "Clemency," 168; for what reason, 168; his conversion, 169; its date, 169; his reverence for the Church, 169; his reserve and shyness, 169; devoted to religious studies, 170; about an address for Nicholas Cop, 170; flies from Paris, 172; visits Béarn, 172; again flies from Paris, 173; his "Psychopannychia," 173; at Strasburg, 173; composes the "Institutes," 173; first prints them in Latin, 173; his dedication to Francis I., 173; his personal characteristics, 174; how esteemed by Melancthon, 175; constant in his opinions, 175; his conception of the Church, 176; his doctrine of Predestination, 176; his practical motive in it, 176; his doctrine compared with Augustine's, 177; with Luther's, 177; not an extremist with regard to rites, 178; his letter to Somerset, 178; criticises the Anglican Church, 178; his letter to Cranmer, 178; contrasted with Luther, 179; his censorious tone, 179; want of health, 179; his passionate temper, 179; his homage to law, 179; his zeal for the honor of God, 180; his hymns, 180, 206; his high qualities, 180; visits the Duchess of Ferrara, 181, 333; stops in Geneva on his return, 181; moved by Farel to remain, 185; his first work there, 185; refuses to administer the Sacrament, 186; is banished, 186; at Strasburg, 186; attends the German conferences, 186; his opposition to the Leipsic Interim, 187; his regard for Luther, 187; his friendship for Melancthon, 187; his relations to the Zwinglian churches, 188; how treated by Berne, 188; his marriage, 188; recalled to Geneva, 188; his letter to Sadolet, 189; his ecclesiastical and civil system, 189; revises the eldership, 190; influence of the Mosaic code on his scheme of government, 191; opposed by the Libertines and Patriots, 192; rejoices at the Edict of St. Germain, 230; condemned the plot to assassinate Guise, 232; favors the forcible suppression of religious error, 195; his conflicts at Geneva, 196; his controversy with Castellio, 196; his vituperative epithets, 197; his concern in the trial and death of Servetus, 197–200; his action in this affair, judged by Guizot, 201; his treatment of Lælius Socinus, 201; his triumph over the Libertines, 203; his description of his conflicts, 203; his labors and influence, 203; his correspondence, 204; his influence on the French reformation, 205;

his last days, 205; his various employments, 204; his last interview with the Senate, 205; with the Clergy, 205; his review of his career, 205; his death, 206; his character, 206; faults of his constitution at Geneva, 207; his letter to Margaret, Q. of Navarre, 213; how regarded by Huguenot martyrs, 221; inculcates obedience to rulers, 224; disapproves of the Amboise conspiracy, 225; charged with Arianism, 185; on Zwingli's view of the Eucharist, 187; his influence in England, 288; his difference from Augustine, 287; his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 130; on the observance of Sunday, 406.
Calvinism, as a theological system, 207; how it promoted civil liberty, 207; its theory of the powers of Church and State, 207; republican character of its church constitution, 208; its theology equalizes men by exalting God, 208; compared with Romanism, in its view of Church and State, 208; sources of opposition to it in France, 215; more attractive to France than Lutheranism, 218; in the Church of England, 286–288; how it spread in the Netherlands, 247; hostility of Lutherans to, 357; its five points, 399.
Calvinists, prevail in the Netherlands, 266; adopt the "Confessio Belgica," 266; do not favor religious liberty in the Netherlands, 267; finally petition for it (1578), 268; their political difference with the Arminians, 269; provision for them in the Treaty of Westphalia, 365; see "Protestants," "Reformation," and under the different countries.
Cambray, Peace of, 104.
Campeggio, legate of Clement VII., 101.
Cappel, war of, 135.
Caracci, school of, 350, 440.
Caraffa, his hostility to doctrinal innovations, 336; on the spread of Protestantism in Italy, 334; organizes the Inquisition in Italy, 342; its cruelty, 343; his Consilium to Paul III., 344; his prohibitory Index, 344.
Carlstadt, disputes with Eck at Leipsic, 85; his iconoclastic movement at Wittenberg, 100.
Carlyle, on the nations which rejected the Reformation, 431.
Carnesecchi, Pietro, 334; put to death, 349.
Carranza, Bartolome de, persecution of, 347.
Cartwright, his principles, 294.
"Casket letters," the question of their genuineness, 319.
Cassander, 405.
Castellio, his charges against Calvin, 196; banished from Geneva, 197.
Cateau-Cambresis, Peace of, 220.
Catharine of Aragon, her marriage with Prince Arthur not consummated, 272.
Catharine de Medici, her childhood, 221; her relations to her husband, 221; her dependence on Diana of Poitiers, 221; her ambition, 222; balked by the Guises, 222; acquires power on the death of Francis II., 227; at the Conference of Bayonne, 233; aims to balance the parties against each other, 233; her motives in making the treaty of St. Germain, 234; plans a marriage between Q. Elizabeth and her son, 235; her jealousy of Coligny, 235; plots his assassination, 236; visits him after he is wounded, 236; her agency in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, 237; her policy after it, 239.
Catharine von Bora, her marriage with Luther, 108.
Catharists, their principles, 45.
Catholics, evangelical, persecution of them, 347.
Catholic reaction, its vitality, how shown, 348; how affected by the defeat of the Armada, 356; by the accession of Henry IV., 356; prostration of it, 385.
Catholicism, Roman, more cherished in Southern Europe, 354.
Catholicism, Spanish, its spirit not suited to France, 216.
Cazalla, Augustine, 346.
Cecil, minister of James I., 367.
Celibacy, its effect on the Papacy, 24.
Cervantes, 438.
Cesarini, Cardinal Julian, 157.
Chalcedon, council of, influenced by Leo I., 16.
Chalmers, on Church and State, 422.
Charlemagne, crowned at Rome, 19; Emperor of the West, 19; his relations to the Papacy, 19; effect of the breaking up of his Empire on the Papacy, 20.
Charles I., his arbitrary principles, 368; his treatment of Papists, 368.
Charles II., his restoration, 372; his declaration from Breda, 372; violates his pledges, 372; his character, 373; Anglican Reaction under, 373; his alliance with Louis XIV., 374.

Charles IV., the Golden Bull of, 90.
Charles V., his struggle with Francis I., 41; his extensive dominions, 91; elected Emperor of Germany, 91; reasons for the choice, 91; alarm occasioned by it in Europe, 92; hostility of Francis I. to, and its grounds, 92; his character, 93; how he acted in the affair of the Reformation, 93; his ruling desire, 93; summons Luther to the Diet of Worms, 94; his regret that he did not then destroy Luther, 97; his agreement with Leo X., 98; his action with regard to the assembly at Spires, 102; league formed against him, 102; chooses to maintain the old idea of the Empire, 103; makes peace with Clement VII., 104; disabled from crushing Protestantism for ten years (from 1532), 137; his expedition to Algiers, 138; his superficial estimate of Protestantism, 143; establishes the Interim, 143; opposed by Paul III., 144; leaves Ferdinand to negotiate with the Protestants, 146; abdicates, 147, 248; baffled by the moral force of Protestantism, 356; his persecution in the Netherlands, 246; its effect on the country, 248; his cloister life, 249; his bigotry, 249; his death, 347.
Charles IX., becomes king of Sweden, 154.
Charles VIII., of France, his invasion of Italy, 9.
Charles IX., of France, his accession, 227; his anger at the Huguenot rising, 233; impressed by Coligny, 235; visits him after he is wounded, 236; his death, 239.
Châtelar, 304.
Chaucer, on the mendicant friars, 29.
Chesterfield, Lord, 2.
Christian II., of Denmark, favors Protestantism, 148; retreats, 149; his cruelty in Sweden, 149; deposed, 149.
Christian III., of Denmark, introduces Protestantism, 150.
Christian IV., of Denmark, his defeat, 360.
Christianity, spirituality of, 12; its relation to culture, 463.
Church, affected by judaizing ideas, 12; simple organization of the apostolic, 12; it is municipal, 13; its officers at the outset, 13; rise of the Episcopate in it, 13; Irenæus and Tertullian on the visible, 14; influence of political models on its polity, 15; primacy of the Roman See in the, 16; effect of the fall of Roman Empire on the, 18; reaction of the spiritual element in the, 44.
Church, the polity of, the principles of the Lutheran Reformers, 410; not realized by them, 411; Zwingli's view of, 416; Calvin's view of, 417.
Church of England, under James I., 366; its new theory of Episcopacy, 366; becomes Arminian, 366; zeal for it after the restoration, 373; theories of its relation to the State, 420; the Erastian doctrine, 420; Hooker's view, 420; Arnold's view, 421; Warburton's view, 421; Coleridge's view, 421; Gladstone's view, 422; Chalmers's view, 422; Macaulay's view, 423.
Church, Roman Catholic, in the United States, 428; how far responsible for persecution, 437; on the reading of the Bible in the vernacular, 446.
Church, Scottish Protestant, its worship and constitution, 322; becomes fully Presbyterian, 323.
Church and State, view of the Reformers on their connection, 410; view of Luther and Melancthon, 412; of Zwingli, 416; of Calvin, 417; their connection in England, 420; Roman Catholic theories, 424; Bellarmine's view, 425; doctrine of the Jesuits, 425; American theory of their relation, 428.
Civil authority, inquiries into the nature of, 33.
Clarendon, Constitutions of, 33.
Clement VII., his treatment of Henry VIII.'s petition for a divorce, 272; cannot induce the Diet of Nuremberg (1524) to suppress Lutheranism, 101; a prisoner of Charles V., 103.
Clement XI., against the Jansenists, 382.
Clementine Homilies, on Peter as Bishop of Rome, 15.
Cloisters, confiscation of their property in England, 274.
Coleridge, on the Papacy, 42; on Church and State, 421.
Colet, 270; his character and services, 64.
Coligni, refuses to join in the Amboise conspiracy, 225; presents the Huguenot petition, 225; takes no part in the assassination of Guise, 232; disapproves of the Edict of Amboise, 232; finds safety in Rochelle, 233; resumes hostilities, 234; at Jarnac and Moncontour, 233; his character, 223; comes to the court, 235; his lofty qualities, 235; his influence over

Charles IX., 235; proposes war with Spain, 236; plot to assassinate him, 236; he is wounded, 236; visited by Charles IX. and Catharine de Medici, 236.
Cologne, Elector of, his conversion to Protestantism, 358.
Colonna, Sciarra, he assaults Boniface VIII., 31.
Colonna, Vittoria, 334.
Compactata, granted to the Utraquists, 157.
Company, the Venerable, at Geneva, 191.
Comprehension, opportunities for, lost by the Church of England, 373, 376.
Compromise, formed by the nobles in the Netherlands, 255; their design, 255.
Concord, Form of, 404.
Condé, Louis, Prince de, his character, 223; privy to the Amboise conspiracy, 225; under arrest at Orléans, 226; tried for treason, 226; his lack of wisdom, 233; finds safety in Rochelle, 233; falls at Jarnac, 233.
Condé, Henry, Prince de, sallies forth with Coligni from Rochelle, 234; excommunicated by Sixtus V., 240.
Conference at Ratisbon, 138.
"Congregatio de propaganda fide," 462.
Congregationalism, in the French Church 419; in New England, 426.
Conrad of Waldhausen, 51.
Consistories in the Lutheran churches, 413.
Consistory, its functions, in Geneva, 190.
Constance, council of, 35; failure of it, 36.
Constantine, relation of Church and State under, and under his successors, 17; his alleged donation exposed by Valla, 330.
Constitution of Germany, 90; alterations of it, under Maximilian, 90.
Contarini, at Ratisbon, 138.
Convocation, in the English Church, 423.
Cop, Nicholas, 170.
Corderius, he teaches Calvin, 167.
Council, of Pisa, 35; of Constance, 35; of Basel, 36.
Council of Trent, condemns Protestant doctrine, 340; Paul III., transfers it to Bologna, 340; its benefit to the Catholic cause, 341.
Councils, the Reforming, 35.
Covenanters of Scotland, 377.
Cox, Bishop of Ely, in the vestment controversy, 292; Elizabeth's treatment of, 295.
Cranmer, his advice to Henry VIII., on the divorce, 273; decrees the divorce, 274; protected by Henry VIII., 277; calls theologians from the continent, 278; his character, 275; his view of the tenure of church officers, 283; proposes a Protestant council, 284; Calvin's letter to, 179; his opinion on the Eucharist, 290; his recantation, 280; his faults, 281; his death, 281; effect of it, 281.
Creeds, Erasmus's opinion of, 68.
Crell, 403.
Cromwell, Oliver, England under, 372; his "Triers," 370.
Cromwell, Thomas, 275; execution of, 277.
Cues, Nicholas of, 56.
Cup, withdrawal of it from the laity, 155; doctrine of Aquinas, 155.
Cyprian, on the primacy of the Roman See, 15; against persecution, 194.
Cyril, missionary in Bohemia, 154.

D'Ailly, his theory of the Episcopate, 35.
D'Albret, Jeanne, Q. of Navarre, her court at Rochelle, 234.
Damascus, John of, 129.
Dandelot, 223.
Dante, heralds a new era of culture, 58; chastises the Papacy, 28, 29; on the design of the Roman Empire, 17; his treatise on monarchy, 33; on the neglect of the classic authors, 58; his theology, 329; on the temporal ambition of the Popes, 328.
Darnley, his marriage with Mary, 314; his character, 315; disgusts his wife, 315; takes part in the murder of Rizzio, 315; ill, and visited by Mary, 317; taken to Kirk-of-field, 318; murdered, 318.
D'Aubigné, Theodore Agrippa, on the origin of the civil wars in France, 231.
D'Aumale, Duc, on the military talents of Henry IV., 241.
Davila, exaggerates the influence of political motives on the Huguenot nobles, 224.
Decretals, Pseudo-Isidorian, 20.
Deism, its rise and spread, 457.
Denmark, reformation in, 148; intervention of, in Germany, 359.
Des Cartes, relation of his system to Protestantism, 452; his personal history, 453; his system favored by the Jansenists, 453; it is opposed by the Sorbonne and the Jesuits, 453; his books placed on the Index, 453.

De Tocqueville, on the French Revolution, 1; on the influence of religion on liberty in America, 434; on the intellectual effects of skepticism, 455.
Dévay, Matthew, the Hungarian reformer, 164.
Diana of Poitiers, mistress of Henry II., 221.
Diaz, Juan, 345.
Dietrich, Veit, on Luther's prayers, 107.
Dilettantism, its prevalence in Italy, in the seventeenth century, 440.
Discipline, "First Book" of, 303; "Second Book" of, 304.
Discoveries and inventions, age of, 9.
Döllinger, on the influence of Luther, 143.
Dominicans, rise of the order of the, 25; their strife with the Jesuits, 355.
Donatists, laws against the, 194.
Donauwörth, seized by Bavaria, 358.
Dorner, his remark on Luther, 142.
Dort, Synod of, English delegates on the, 366; its creed, 399.
Douay, Jesuit establishment in, 351.
Doumergue, Prof. C., cited, 171.
Drake, Sir Francis, 324.
Dreux, battle of, 232.
Du Perron, 242.
Duprat, Chancellor, 212.
Du Tillet, 185.
Dyer, on Servetus, 199.

Eck, at the Leipsic disputation, 85; writes against Luther, 83.
Eckart, Master, his Pantheistic tendency, 54.
Edinburgh, treaty of, 303.
Edward III., of England, 33; protects Wickliffe, 50.
Edward VI., his precocity, 278.
Egmont, his character, 250; his mission to Spain, 254; his cruelty to the iconoclasts, 257; his execution, 260.
Eldership, revived by Calvin, 260.
Elizabeth, Queen, welcomed to the throne, 282; how treated by Paul IV., 282; her conservatism in religion, 282; her treatment of Roman Catholics, 283; persecution under, 267; her imperious treatment of her bishops, 295; sends aid to the Scottish insurgents, 303; her matrimonial plans for Mary, Queen of Scots, 313; refuses to guarantee the succession, 314; her professed indignation at the treatment of Mary, 323; disposed to restore her to her throne, 323; compelled to support Murray and the lords, 323; Catholic combination against her, 324.
Emperors, Roman, favor the See of Rome, 17.
Empire, German, conflict of the Papacy with the, 21; disadvantages of, in the conflict, 22.
Empire, Roman, supposed to be restored by Charlemagne, 19.
England disposed in the fourteenth century to check Papal aggressions, 33; monarchy, in the fifteenth century, in, 36; revival of learning in, 65; jealousy of the hierarchy in, 273; two parties under Henry VIII., in, 275; rebellion in (1536), 276; its desultory conflict with Spain, 325; defeats the Armada, 325; its position under the Stuarts, 365; subservience to Spain under James I., 367; its influence under Cromwell, 372; origin of Deism in, 457.
England, the Church of, framing of its articles and prayer-book, 278; are its articles Calvinistic, 287; its opinion on the Eucharist, 289; its doctrine of predestination, 287; makes the Bible the rule of faith, 389; Calvin's remarks on, 178; its general character, 283; its relation to the Protestant churches abroad, 284; its friendship for the Swiss churches, 284.
England, the Reformation in, how introduced, 271; the peculiarity of, 271; less prominence of its leaders, 271; reaction against it at the accession of Mary, 279.
Enzinas, Jayme, 345.
Episcopacy, little controversy about it among the first Protestants, 284; Melancthon's view of, 284; Cranmer's opinion, 284; Lord Bacon on, 285.
"Episcopal system," in Germany, 416.
Episcopate, rise of the, 13.
Episcopius, 398.
Erasmus, at Oxford, 65; the principal representative of Humanism, 66; his popularity and fame, 66; compared with Voltaire, 66; his attainments, 66; compared with Budæus, 66; his patrons and his love of independence, 67; the foe of superstition, 67; his experience of monasticism, 67; his warfare with monks, 67; his "Praise of Folly," and "Colloquies," 67; offends the Franciscans, 68; his hatred of Pharisaism, 68; his opinion of creeds, 68; favors religious liberty, 68; charged with heresy, 68; his "Colloquies," condemned by the University of Paris, 69; his editions of the Fathers, 69; his edition of the

New Testament, and commentaries 69; his merits estimated by Strauss, 70; inference from the reception of his writings, 70; on Luther's writings in England, 270; applauds the first movement of Luther, 112; his caution, 112; his remark to the Elector Frederic, 112; a typical latitudinarian, 112; prefers Jerome to Augustine, 112; his love of peace, 112; irritated by the tone of Luther, 112; his quarrel with Ulrich von Hutten, 113; writes on free-will against Luther, 113; progress of his alienation from Luther and the Reformation, 113; his description of Farel, 183; on the influence of Protestantism on literature, 438.
Erastianism, 420.
Erastians, in the Westminster Assembly, 369.
Eric XVI., King of Sweden, 154.
Eucharist, controversy on, between Lutherans and Swiss, 129; history of the doctrine, 129; Luther's doctrine, 129; Zwingli's doctrine, 130; efforts to heal the difference, 132; conference at Marburg, 132; mutual misunderstanding of the parties, 134; Melancthon abandons the Lutheran doctrine of the, 140; great controverted topic among the reformers, 289; the different views of, 290; opinion of the Church of England on, 290; Cranmer's view of, 290; Jewel's view of, 291.
Europe, its condition after the reforming councils, 36.
Evelyn, on the court of Charles II., 374.

Faber, 338.
Fagius, a professor at Cambridge, 278.
Farel, his character, 183; preaches Protestantism in Geneva, 183; how described by Erasmus, 183; goes to Briçonnet, 211.
Ferdinand I., becomes King of Hungary, 163; faithful to the Peace of Augsburg, 357.
Ferdinand II., Emperor, his fanaticism, 358.
Ferrara, Protestantism in, 333.
Feudal system, occasions the conflict of the Papacy and the Empire, 22.
Ficinus, Marsilius, 456; his philosophy, 62.
Flaminio, 333.
Florence, Protestantism in, 333.
Fontainebleau, assembly of notables at, 225.
Fontenay, battle of, 72.
France, the Reformation in, emanated from Humanism, 209; two parties in the court, 212; its disciples protected by Margaret, Queen of Navarre, 213; doubtful character of its prospects, 214; how regarded by Henry II., 219; its progress in his reign, 219; monarchy in the fifteenth century in, 36; Rome, Renaissance and the Reformation offered to its choice, 215; it supports Philip the Fair against Boniface VIII., 31; what it acquired by the Peace of Westphalia, 365; its literature in the age of Louis XIV., 442; polity of the Huguenot churches in, 419; effect of the persecution of the Huguenots on, 383; effect of religious persecution on, 457.
Francis I., he abandons the Pragmatic Sanction, 40; his struggle with Charles V., 41; not chosen emperor, and why, 92; grounds of his disagreement with Charles V., 92; his strength compared with that of Charles, 92; captured at Pavia, 102; labors to prevent the union of Protestants and Catholics in Germany, 138; his vacillation with regard to reform, 216; its consequences, 217; boasts of the religious unity of France, 217; enraged by the placards, 217; invites Melancthon to Paris, 217; the patron of letters, 209; establishes the College of the Three languages, 213; opposes the Sorbonne and Parliament, 213; seeks to conciliate the clergy, 214; imprisons Beda, 214; approaches nearer to the Protestants, 215; sanctions the creed of the Sorbonne, 218; opposes the union of Catholics and Protestants, 336.
Francis II., his accession, 222; subject to the Guises, 222; death of, 227.
Francis of Sickingen, his defeat and death, 116.
Franciscans, rise of the order of the, 25; offended by Erasmus, 68.
Franks, alliance of the Papacy with, 18; their protection to Boniface, 19.
Frederic Barbarossa, his submission to Pope Alexander III., 24.
Frederic I., of Denmark, his policy respecting Protestantism, 150.
Frederic II., the Emperor, 329; his relation to Innocent III., 25.
Frederic V., Elector Palatine, made King of Bohemia, 359; robbed of the electorate, 360.
Frederic, Elector of Saxony, founds the

University of Wittenberg, 64; the imperial office offered to, 91; why declined by, 91; regent in North Germany, 93; disposed to protect Luther, 93; warns Luther not to leave the Wartburg, 98.
Friends of God, 54.
Frobenius, 72.
Froude, his estimate of Henry VIII., 277; on the effect of the Reformation in Scotland, 450.

Galileo, the persecution of, 440.
Gallicanism, its theory of the Papacy, 35; where it places infallibility, 35; its type of reform, 48; four propositions of, 380.
Gardiner, renounces the doctrine of the king's supremacy, 280.
Geneva, how governed in the Middle Ages, 182; recognized as a city of the empire, 182; under the Dukes of Savoy, 182; freed from Savoy, 182; divided into two parties, 182; drives out the bishop and becomes Protestant, 182; its discontent with the Protestant régime, 184; low state of morals in, 184; banishes Calvin and the other preachers, 186; recalls Calvin, 188; system established by Calvin in, 190; its severity, 193; a religious center under Calvin, 203; academy of, 204; delivered from faction, 204; an asylum for persecuted Frenchmen, 219; sends books and colporteurs into France, 219; how regarded by Huguenot martyrs, 221.
Genin, on Margaret of Navarre, 213.
Gentili, 402.
George, Duke of Saxony, 86.
German nations, their ready reception of Christianity, 7; the Christianity which they received, 7.
Germany, Papal aggressions upon, in the fourteenth century, 32; influence of Mystics in, in the fourteenth century, 54; character of the revival of learning in, 63; character of its people, 72; their reception of the Gospel, 73; its early resistance of the clergy, 73; its religion described by Tacitus, 72; Mysticism in, 72; why it gave birth to the Reformation, 73; its political condition at the beginning of the Reformation, 90; the electoral system in, 90; power of the Diet, 90; private wars, 90; efforts under Maximilian to improve the constitution, 90; their result, 90; ferment and discord, in, 91; Charles V., elected emperor of, 91; how regarded by Charles V., 93; its complaints against Pope Julius II., 38.
Germany, the Reformation in, Diet of Spires (1526) refuses to stifle it, 103; alliance of Catholic princes and bishops at Ratisbon to check it, 102; sprang from the people, 356.
"German theology," Luther's estimate of it, 55.
Gerson, 425; his theory of the Episcopate, 35.
Ghent, pacification of, 262.
Gibbon, on the influence of Erasmus, 112.
Gladstone, on Church and State, 422.
Gomarus, his theology, 398.
Granvelle, Bishop of Arras, his character, 250.
Greek Church, more and more distinct from the Latin, 18.
Gregorovius, on the spirit of nationalism, 26.
Gregory I., he sends missionaries to the Anglo-Saxons, 19; on the reading of the Bible by the laity, 447.
Gregory VII., supported by divisions in Germany, 24.
Gregory IX., Pope, his vindictiveness towards Frederic II., 23.
Gregory X., Pope, his direction to the German Electors, 24.
Gregory XVI., Pope, 437.
Grimm, on the religion of the Germans, 72.
Grindal, his opinion on the use of vestments by the clergy, 293.
Grotius, on the Atonement, 399; his efforts for the reunion of Protestants and Catholics, 406; on the Decalogue, 406; died a Protestant, 407.
Gualter, his friendship with English divines, 284.
Guicciardini, on Leo X., 39.
Guise, Claude of, 222.
Guise, the family of, their history, 222; their control over Francis II., 222; their connection with Diana of Poitiers, 223; dissatisfaction of the Bourbons and Chatillons with, 223.
Guise, Charles, Cardinal of, 222.
Guise, Duke Francis of, 222; avenges the Amboise conspiracy, 225; one of Triumvirate, 228; perpetrates the massacre of Vassy, 230; received in Paris with acclaim, 230; assassinated, 232; his assassination condemned by Calvin, 232.
Guise, Henry of, plots the assassination of Coligny, 236; organizes the Catholic League, 239.

Guizot, his view of the Reformation, 4; his judgment respecting Calvin and Servetus, 201.
Gustavus Adolphus, his intervention in Germany, 362; how regarded by Brandenburg and Saxony, 362; his aims, 362; his death at Lutzen, 362; his relations to Richelieu, 363.

Hadrian IV , his bull with regard to Ireland, 325.
Hallam, on the anti-hierarchical literature, 27; on Luther's bad Latin, 110; on Cranmer, 275; on the Hampton Court Conference, 367.
Hamilton, Patrick, 300.
Hamilton, Sir William, 116.
Hampton Court Conference, 367.
Hare, on the character and position of Luther, 74.
Hazlitt, on the Elizabethan authors, 449.
Heeren, 433.
Hefele, on the massacre of the Albigenses, 46; his criticism of Llorente, 342.
Hegel, on Luther's Bible, 99; on the German Reformation, 73.
Heilbronn, Treaty of, 363.
Henry, the Deacon, 45.
Henry II., of France, his attitude towards Protestantism, 219; engages in persecution, 220; his death, 220.
Henry III., of France, his account of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, 237, 238; his character, 239; makes peace with the Huguenots and Politiques, 239; assassinates the Guises, 240; his assassination, 240.
Henry III., of Germany, he intervenes in the affairs of the Papacy, 21.
Henry IV., of France, sallies forth (Prince of Navarre) with Coligny from Rochelle, 234; excommunicated by Sixtus V., 240; his war with the League, 241; wins the battle of Ivry, 241; his contest with Alexander of Parma, 241; his abjuration, 242; effects of it, 243; his administration, 243; his foreign policy, 244; grants the Edict of Nantes, 244; his accession a blow to the Catholic reaction, 244; his plans at the time of his death, 377.
Henry IV., of Germany, weakened by divisions in Germany, 23; at Canossa, 23.
Henry VII., of England, 36.
Henry VIII., his controversy with Luther, 109; tone of his book, 110; Luther's letter of apology to, 111; his application for a divorce, 272; made head of the Church of England, 274; his divorce and marriage with Anne Boleyn, 273; his divorce decreed by Cranmer, 274; publishes the Bible in English, 275; proclaims the ten articles, 276; his persecution of Protestants, 276; executes Anne Boleyn, 276; his marriage with Anna of Cleves, 276; his character, 277; effect of his death on religious parties, 277.
Herbert, Lord, 457.
Herzog, on the Waldenses, 47.
Hesse, plan for the Church constitution of, 414.
Hierarchy, attacked in the fourteenth century, 34; its government discarded by the Reformers, 410.
High commission, court of, 282.
Hildebrand, his reforming plan, 21.
Hincmar, of Rheims, humbled by Nicholas I., 21.
History, modern, most prominent events of, 1.
Holland, benefit of the Reformation to, 450.
Homberg, synod of, 414.
Hoogstraten, his persecution of Reuchlin, 63.
Hooker, on the validity of Presbyterian ordination, 285; contrasted with Whitgift, 289; his treatise, 296; on Church and State, 296, 420.
Hooper, had resided at Zurich, 292; is imprisoned, 292; his martyrdom, 280.
Horn, his execution, 260.
Hosack, on Mary, Queen of Scots, 321.
Huguenots, persecution of, under Henry II., 220; their number in 1558, 220; effect of persecution on, 220; become a political party, 221; a measure of toleration granted them (1562), 229; their union with the great nobles, 223; their long patience, 224; plot for their destruction at Orléans, 226; origin of the name, 227; belonged to what classes, 227; iconoclasm by the, 231; acted in self-defense in the civil wars, 231; provoked to resistance by illegal violence, 231; anticipate an attack by taking up arms, 232; their fortitude after Jarnac and Moncontour, 234; how affected by the slaughter of St. Bartholomew, 239; after the abjuration of Henry IV., 243; protected by the Edict of Nantes, 244; becomes a defensive party, 244; in-

surrection of (1621), 378; persecution of, by Louis XIV., 382.
Humanism, in Italy, its lack of heroism, 330; its polemical ferocity, 331; how fostered in France, 210.
Humanists, they rally to defend Reuchlin, their relation to the Universities, 64.
Hume, on the cause of the Reformation, 3.
Hungary, spread of Protestantism in, 163; civil war in, 164; Eucharistic strife in, 164.
Hunt, on the Calvinism of the English Reformers, 287.
Huntley, Earl of, 305.
Huss, by whom influenced, 51; works on, 50; his spirit and opinions, 51; Luther's declaration respecting, 86; safe-conduct of, 51; his execution, 51; effect of it in Bohemia, 154.
Hussites, crusades against the, 52.
Hutchinson, Mrs., on the doctrine of Predestination, 366.
Hutten, he aids Reuchlin, 64; one of the authors of the Epist. Obsc. Virorum, 64.
Hymns, Luther's, 107, 180; Calvin's, 180.

Iceland, Reformation in, 152.
Iconoclasm in Scotland, 303; by the Huguenots, 231; in the Netherlands, 257; England spared from, 298.
"Imitation of Christ," character of it, 55.
Independents, their rise and tenets, 296; in the Westminster Assembly, 369; attain to power, 370; their polity in New England, 426.
Index Prohibitorius, 344, 443; authors in the, 443.
Indulgence, declaration of, 374.
Indulgences, history of, 79; doctrine of Aquinas respecting, 79; connected with the treasury of supererogatory merits, by Aquinas and Alexander of Hales, 80; doctrine of Pope Sixtus IV., 80; how sold by Tetzel, 80; Luther's protest against the trade in, 81; his doctrine of, 81; bull of Leo X. respecting, 84; Zwingli preaches against the sale of, 122.
Innocent III., carries the Papal power to its height, 24; his idea of a Papal theocracy, 24; on the relation of the Church to the State, 24; raises up, and excommunicates Otho IV., 25; elevates Frederic II., 25; reduces John of England to submission, 25; his claims, 25; his legates, 25; supported by the mendicant orders, 25; his crusade against the Albigenses, 46; for the enforcement of uniformity, 194.
Innocent VIII., Pope, his character, 37.
Innocent X., his controversy with Louis XIV., 379.
Inquisition used against the Albigenses, 46; its form in the Netherlands, 255; its effect, 255; reorganized in Italy, 341; its vigilance in Spain, 346.
Inquisitors, origin of the term, 194.
Interim, Leipsic, 143; opposed by Calvin, 187.
Intolerance, history of, 193; in the Roman Empire, 194; in the Middle Ages, 194; influence of the Mosaic legislation on, 195; not favored by Zwingli, 194; expressions of Luther against, 195; advocated by Calvin, 195; in England under Elizabeth, 267; opposed by William of Orange, 267; exercised in Protestant countries, 435; incongruous with the genius of Protestantism, 437; how far Catholics are responsible for, 437.
Ireland, Protestantism in, 325; Protestant hierarchy established in, 326; effect of the Catholic reaction on, 326; Lord Bacon's advice respecting, 326.
Irenæus, on the visible Church, 14.
Italy, revival of learning in, 58; character of the revival of learning in, 61; religion in, in the fifteenth century, 62; tone of ethical feeling in, in the fifteenth century, 62; influence of its culture in France, 209; its condition in the fifteenth century, 327; effect of classical studies in, 330; character of Humanists in, 330; how changed intellectually after the Reformation, 349; interest in natural science springs up in, 349; effect of the Catholic reaction on, 349; Antitrinitarians in, 402.

Jacob, on the origin of the Episcopate, 13.
Jagellon, house of, 163.
James V., of Scotland, Protestant martyrs in his reign, 300.
James I., of England, his birth, 316; crowned at Stirling, 321; his reign, 365; his treatment of the Puritans, 366; at the Hampton Court Conference, 367; sends delegates to the Synod of Dort, 366; his attempt to

impose Episcopacy on the Scottish Church, 368; his opinion of Laud, 368.
James II., his arbitrary principles, 375; his court of high commission, 375; his declaration for liberty of conscience, 375; loses his crown, 375.
Jansenism, origin of, 380.
Jansenists, persecution of them, 382; on the reading of the Bible by the laity, 447.
Jansenius, 381.
Jeffries, Judge, 445.
Jerome, of Prague, his execution, 51.
Jesuits, order of, its origin, 337; its organization, 339; its influence, 339; its doctrine of regicide, 425; its educational influence, 350; result of its efforts against Protestantism, 351; its influence in France, 351; at Douay, 351; in Sweden, 351; in Austria, 357; effect of its training on the intellect, 445; decay of its zeal, 381; its lax ethical maxims, 381; its strife with the Dominicans, 355; its suppression, 436.
Jesuitism, of Loyola, not that of the "Provincial Letters," 339.
Jewel, his opinion on the Eucharist, 291.
John, Don, of Austria, his government in the Netherlands, 262; his death, 262.
John of Damascus, teaches transubstantiation, 129.
John, King of England, humbled by Innocent III., 25.
John of Paris, maintains the rights of the civil authority, 33.
John XXII., his treatment of the Emperor Louis of Bavaria, 32; charged with heresy by the Minorites, 34.
John XXIII., attempts to control the Council of Pisa, 35.
John of Savoy, bishop of Geneva, 182.
John, Elector of Saxony, his noble conduct at Augsburg (1530), 105.
John III., king of Sweden, 154.
John Frederic, Elector, captured at Mühlberg, 143; released, 146.
John of Zápolya, 164.
Johnson, Dr. Samuel, on convocation in the English Church, 424.
Jonas, Justus, 290.
Jortin, his Life of Erasmus, 66.
Julius II., Pope, his character, 38; complaints of Germany against, 38; covert reference to, in the "Colloquies" of Erasmus, 68.
Julius III., Pope, favorable to Charles V., 144.
Jus Reformandi, granted in the Peace of Augsburg, 146; how modified in the treaty of Westphalia, 365.
Justification, departure from the Pauline doctrine of, 13; spread in Italy of the Protestant doctrine of, 333; Protestant doctrine of, in Spain, 346; first point of controversy between Catholics and Protestants, 387; Protestant doctrine of, 388; Roman Catholic doctrine of, 390.

Kampschulte, his Life of Calvin, 166.
Keble, John, his edition of Hooker, 285.
Kempis, Thomas à, his "Imitation of Christ," 55.
Kepler, his view of Astrology, 3.
Knox, John, returns to Scotland (1559), 301; his early life, 301; in the castle of St. Andrews, 301; called to preach, 301; a captive in France, 301; preaches in North England, 302; declines a bishopric in England, 302; at Frankfort, 302; at Geneva, 302; his book on the "Regimen of Women," 302; returns to Scotland (1555), 302; preaches against idolatry, 302; detested by Elizabeth, 303; his disagreement with the lords, 304; his opposition to the Queen's mass, 306; his interview with her, 306; his debate with her on the limits of civil obedience, 308; preaches against dancing at Holyrood, 309; another interview with Mary, 309; further discussion with her, 310; preaches against her projected marriage, 311; she summons him to her presence, 311; cited before the privy council, 312; his description of the scene, 312; temporary breach with Murray, 312; his public prayer for the Queen, 312; no advocate of toleration, 313; his form of worship, 322; his last days, 323.

La Chaise, 382.
Laical spirit, how manifested before the Reformation, 70.
Lainez, advocates popular sovereignty, 425.
Lambert, his Church constitution for Hesse, 414; Luther's judgment of it, 415.
Lang, Andrew, on Mary of Scotland, 321.
Lang, August, on Calvin's conversion, 170.
Languages, rise of the national, 27.
Langland, William, his poem, 28.
La Renaudie, 225.
Lasco, John à, his career, and work in Poland, 162.

Lateran, 5th Council of the, 61.
Latimer, his martyrdom, 280.
Laud, maintains a *jure divino* Episcopacy, 285; his policy, 368; James I.'s opinion of, 368; his censorship of the press, 444.
Laurent, his view of the Reformation, 6; on the state of religion in the sixteenth century, 6.
Law, International, progress of the science of, 454.
Law, T. G., cited, 321.
Lawrence, Archbishop, on the Anglican articles, 286.
League, Catholic, in France, organized, 239; it commences war, 239; refuses to acknowledge Henry IV., 240; war with Henry IV., 241; its relations to Spain, 241; Catholic, in Germany, (1538), 137; Catholic, in Germany, (1609), 358.
League of Smalcald, formed, 136; weakened by discord, 139.
Learning, the revival of, begins in Italy, 57; influence of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio on, 58.
Lecky, on religious persecution, 196.
Lefèvre, his writings, 210; his doctrines, 210; flies to Strasburg, 211; on geographical discoveries and reform, 74.
Legates, sent out by Innocent III., 25.
Legists, their anti-hierarchical spirit, 30; the allies of monarchy, 30.
Leibnitz, his efforts for the reunion of churches, 407; his correspondence with Landgrave Ernest, and with Bossuet, 407; his remedy for divisions, 407; his ecclesiastical position, 408.
Leipsic, Disputation at, 85; its effect on Luther, 86.
Leo I., his influence on the council of Chalcedon, 16; founds the Roman primacy on succession from Peter, 17; his character, 17.
Leo X., calls the Reformation a quarrel of monks, 3; Luther's letter to him, 87; excommunicates Luther, 88; his bull on the subject of indulgences, 84; his opposition to the election of Charles V., 98; his agreement with him, 98; insists on the burning of heretics, 195; his character, 38; Sarpi on, 38; Pallavicini on, 39; Muratori on, 39; Guicciardini on, 39; Roscoe on, 39.
Leo, H., his view of the Reformation, 3.
Le Tellier, father, 382, 383.
Leyden, siege of, 261; the Pilgrim church of, 371.
L'Hospital, favors toleration, 228.
Liberty, religious, favored by Erasmus, 68; see "Intolerance."
Libertines, the party of, at Geneva, 192; their strength when Servetus was tried, 200; finally crushed by Calvin, 202.
Lightfoot, J., 369.
Lightfoot, J. B., on the origin of the Episcopate, 13.
Lingard, on Cranmer, 281.
Literature, character of the vernacular, in the Middle Ages, 27; its decline in Spain, 438; in Italy, 439; English, in the Elizabethan age, 448.
Littré, on the word "Huguenot," 227.
Livonia, Protestantism in, 161.
Llorente, his history of the Inquisition, 342; Hefele's criticism of, 342.
Lollards, in England before the Reformation, 270; listen to John Knox, 270.
Lombards, they threaten Rome, 19.
Longjumeau, peace of, 232.
Lope de Vega, 438.
Lords of the congregation, determine to stop persecution, 302; refuse to devote church property to schools, etc., 304.
Lorenzo II., of Florence, 221.
Lorraine, Cardinal Charles of, his reasons for desiring a colloquy at Poissy, 228.
Lothair II., disciplined by Nicholas I., 20.
Louis of Bavaria, how treated by John XXII., 32.
Louis de Berquin, his death, 214.
Louis, Count of Nassau, 255; defeated and slain, 261.
Louis II., King of Hungary, his death, 163.
Louis IX., intercedes for Frederic II., 23.
Louis XIV., his alliance with Charles II., 374; his aims, 379; his controversy with Innocent X., 379; supported by the French clergy (1682), 380; agreement with Innocent XII., 380; his persecution of the Huguenots, 382; under the influence of La Chaise, 382; revokes the edict of Nantes, 383; success and ultimate failure of his foreign policy, 383.
Louisa, of Savoy, 212.
Loyola, Ignatius, his history, 337; his "Spiritual Exercises," 339.
Lübeck, the Reformation in, 151.
Luther, message of Maximilian I. respecting, 41; on the opinions of Wessel, 52; a student of Occam, 61; his doctrine of the Lord's Supper suggested by D'Ailly, 61; the hero of the Reformation, 73; his birth and parentage, 74; studies at Magdeburg, Eisenach, Erfurt, 75; enters the convent at Erfurt, 75; his motive,

75; made professor at Wittenberg, 77; his studies and growing reputation, 77; his religious experience, 78; aided by Staupitz, 77; studies Augustine and Tauler, 77; sees that justification is by faith, 78; visits Rome, 78; his delight in the Bible, 78; gradual progress of his mind, 78; preaches against Tetzel, 79; posts his ninety-five Theses, 79; their contents, 79; conscientious in his movement, 81; had no thought of renouncing the Pope or the Church, 81; commotion caused by his Theses, 82; replies to the attacks of Prierias, Tetzel, and Eck, 83; is summoned to Rome, 83; interviews with Cajetan at Augsburg, 83; declines to retract his declarations, 84; appeals to the Pope, better informed, 84; his doctrine denied in a bull of Leo X., 84; appeals from the Pope to a general council, 84; concludes a truce with Miltitz, 84; takes part in the Leipsic Disputation, 84; accompanied by Melancthon, 84; his geniality and humor, 85; his declarations at Leipsic, 86; how influenced by the disputation, 86; he appeals to the laity; his address to the nobles, 86; strikes at the distinction between layman and priest, 87; his treatise on the Babylonian captivity of the Church, 87; attacks transubstantiation, 87; his letter to Leo X., 87; his sermon on the freedom of a Christian man, 88; his mind in a state of transition in respect to Papal and Church authority, 88; excommunicated, 88; burns the Bull, 89; political sympathy with, 89; literary support of, 89; seconded by Ulrich Von Hutten, 89; protected by Frederic the Wise, 93; summoned to the Diet of Worms, 94; his journey, 95; appears before the Diet, 96; why he asked for delay, 96; refuses to recant, 96; decree against him, 97; motives of it, 98 under the ban of the Church and the empire, 98; in the Wartburg, 98; translates the New Testament, 99; character of his translation of the Bible, 99; returns to Wittenberg, 100; quells the disorders there, 101; his conservatism with regard to rites, 100; his reply to the warning of the elector, 101; his herculean labors, 101; his rapid composition, 101; his domestic character, 108; his opposition to armed resistance, 104; at Coburg, 105; his letters from there, 105; encourages Melancthon, 107; his prayers, 107; on ceremonies, 108; his marriage, 108; commotion caused by it, 108; his controversy with Henry VIII., 109; his vehemence, 109; his letter of apology to Henry VIII., 111; his relations to Erasmus, 111; his opinion of Jerome and Augustine, 112; irritates Erasmus, 112; controversy with him on the will, 113; his relations with him afterwards, 113; how far right in his judgments of Erasmus, 115; easily misrepresented, and why, 116; on the peasants' war, 116; contrasted with Zwingli, 126; a man of the people, 127; but stands aloof from politics, 127; preceded Zwingli in breaking with the Papacy, 128; his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 129; his hostility to the Zwinglian doctrine, 130; grounds of it, 131; derives arguments from Occam, 132; at the conference at Marburg, 132; softened feeling towards the Zwinglians, 133; renews his attack upon them, 134; waives his opposition to armed resistance, 136; his death, 139; his last days, 139; his conflict with the jurists, 140; his relations to Melancthon, 140; his power and influence, 142; remarks of Dorner and Döllinger on, 142; his letter to Polish Lutherans, 161; Calvin compared with, 179; Calvin's remarks on, 187; his opinion of Calvin's letter to Sadolet, 189; on the sermons of Huss, 51; his hymn on the martyrs of Brussels, 247; reception of his writings in England, 271; his writings circulated in Italy, 331; in Spain, 345; his commentary on the Galatians, 389; his catechisms, 413; on the Synod of Homberg, 415; on the nature of laws, 415; on the observance of Sunday, 406; on Aristotle, 451; his criticism of the canon, 458.

Lutheranism, not suited to France, 218.

Lutherans, effect of their hostility to Calvinism on the, 357.

Lutzen, battle of, 362.

Macaulay, on Cranmer, 275; on Church and State, 423; his comparison of Catholic and Protestant nations, 430.

Macchiavelli, his "Prince," 63.

Mackintosh, on Henry VIII., 277.

Madrid, Peace of (1526), 102.

Magdeburg, resists the Interim and the Emperor, 144.

Mair, John, 301.

Manicheans, 45; laws against, 194.
Marburg, conference at, 132.
Margaret, Queen of Navarre, her court visited by Calvin, 172; her mystical and reformatory tendencies, 212; her writings, 212; protects the Protestants, 213; Calvin's letter to, 213.
Margaret of Parma,, made Regent in the Netherlands, 250; her dislike of Alva, 258.
Margaret, of Savoy, Regent in the Netherlands, not disposed to persecution, 247.
Maria, Queen of Hungary, Regent in the Netherlands, 247.
Mark, William de la, heads the "sea-beggars," 261.
Marot, Clement, in Ferrara, 333; his version of the Psalms, 219; they are sung by martyrs, 221.
Marsilius of Padua, his "Defensor Pacis," 34.
Martel, Charles, defeats the Mohammedans, 19.
Martin V., his conduct after he was chosen Pope, 36.
Martin, Henri, on Zwingli, 125; on the slaughter of St. Bartholomew, 237.
Martyr, Peter, called to England, 278; on predestination, 286; becomes a Protestant, 335; flies from Italy, 343.
Mary, Queen of England, restores Catholicism, 279; her marriage with Philip II., 279; becomes unpopular, 281.
Mary, Regent of Scotland, her course towards the Protestants, 301; her death, 303.
Mary de Medici, seeks an alliance with Spain, 377.
Mary, Queen of Scots, peril to England from her pretensions, 299; returns to Scotland, 304; her qualities, 304; her policy respecting religion, 305; celebrates mass in her chapel, 305; her relations to Murray, 305; crushes the Earl of Huntley, 305; debates with Knox on the obligations of a subject, 308; holds another interview with Knox, 309; sends for him again, 310; her projected marriage with a Catholic Prince, 311; it is publicly opposed by Knox, 311; she calls him to account, 311; cites Knox before the privy council, 312; her marriage with Darnley, 314; Elizabeth's displeasure with it, 314; alarm of the Protestants, 314; they take up arms, 314; she is disgusted with her husband, 315, 316; escapes from Holyrood to Dunbar, 315; her attachment to Bothwell, 316; she visits Darnley, 317; takes him to Kirk-of-field, 318; her abduction by Bothwell, 318; she marries him, 319; captured at Carberry-Hill, 319; insulted by the people, 319; a prisoner in Lochleven, 319; Melville on her attachment to Bothwell, 319; did she write the "casket letters"? 319; abdicates and appoints Murray regent, 321; escapes from Lochleven, 323; defeated at Langside, 323; escapes to England, 324; the hope of the enemies of Elizabeth, 325; her execution, 325.
Maryland, religious liberty in, 428.
Massacre of St. Bartholomew, how planned, 237; number killed in Paris and elsewhere, 238; joy in Rome and Madrid, 238; its effect on the Huguenots, 239.
Massachusetts, alleged intolerance in, 371.
Mathesius, on the religious instruction given to youth before the Reformation, 75.
Maurice, Prince of Orange, 266; his quarrel with the Elector John Frederic, 139; his character, 139; his defection, 139; turns against Charles V., and why, 145; chases him out of Innsbruck, 146.
Maurus, Rabanus, denied transubstantiation, 129.
Maximilian I., his message about Luther, 41.
Maximilian II., inclined to Protestantism, 357.
Maximilian, of Bavaria, leader of the Catholic League, 358.
Mayenne, Duke of, 241.
Mazarin, his policy, 379.
Meaux, spirit of reform in, 211.
Medici, Julian and Lorenzo de, plot for their assassination 37.
Melancthon, his character, 84; Reuchlin's prophecy respecting, 85; his belief in astrology, 3; on the year of Luther's birth, 74; his doings at the Diet of Augsburg (1530), 105; cheered by Luther, 107; at the conference at Marburg, 132; changes his opinion on the Eucharist and Predestination, 140; his changed relations to Luther, 140; his funeral address on Luther, 142; his connection with the Leipsic Interim, 144; his concessions, 144; offended by a letter of Calvin, 179; Calvin's affection for, 214; opposes

Calvin's doctrine of Predestination, 187; on the execution of Servetus, 202; invited to Paris by Francis I., 217; his commentary on the Romans, 389; on the spread of Protestantism in Italy, 334; on the observance of Sunday, 406.
Melville, Andrew, 323.
Melville, James, his description of Knox, 323.
Melville, Sir James, on the policy prescribed to Mary of Scotland, 305; on the abduction of Mary, 318; on her love for Bothwell, 319.
Mendicant orders, how treated by Chaucer, 29.
Menno, his influence on the Anabaptists, 266.
Mennonites, their character, 266.
Mersenne, 457.
Methodius, a missionary in Bohemia, 154.
Michelet, on Catharine de Medici, 237; on Richelieu, 379.
Middle Ages, Christianity of the, 6; characterized, 70; character of religion, in the, 43.
Mignet, on the vacillation of Francis I., 216.
Millenary petition, 366.
Milman, on the anti-hierarchical spirit of the early vernacular literature, 28.
Militz, 50.
Miltitz, his negotiation with Luther, 84.
Milton, on the slavery of the press in Italy, 443; his visit to Galileo, 444; on the liberty of the press, 444; on forbidding the mass, 445; on Arminius, 445.
Minorites, principles of the, 34.
Missions, Protestant and Catholic, 462.
Mohammedanism, its progress in Europe, 19; checked by Charles Martel, 19.
Möhler, on Protestantism and Rationalism, 5.
Molanus, his correspondence with Bossuet, 407.
Molina, his system, 380.
Monarchy, its victory over feudalism, 9; the watchword of the opponents of the Papacy in the fourteenth century, 33; consolidation of, in Europe in the fifteenth century, 36; Dante's treatise on, 33.
Monasticism, opposition of Erasmus to, 67; origin of, 67.
Montaigne, his father on the tendency of the Reformation, 5; his skepticism, 216.
Montmorenci, outstripped by the Guises, 222; one of the Triumvirate, 228.
Morata, Professor at Ferrara, 333.
More, Sir Thomas at Oxford, 65; his "Utopia," 65; the execution of, 277.
Mornay, Du Plessis, his disputation with Du Perron, 243.
Morone, on the spread of Protestantism in Italy, 333; persecution of, 344.
Morton, Earl of, 317.
Mühlberg, battle of, 143.
Murray, conducts the government of Scotland under Mary, 306; incurs the displeasure of Knox, 312; takes up arms on the Queen's marriage, 314; took no part in the murder of Darnley, 317; Spottiswoode's opinion of, 320; his perspicacity and firmness, 323; brings forward the "casket letters," 324.
Mysticism, the nature of, 54; in Anselm, 54; of Briçonnet and his friends, 211.
Mystics, in the Middle Ages, 54; works on the, 54; the pioneers of the Reformation, 55.

Names, how rendered into Greek and Latin, 85.
Nantes, Edict of, established, 244; its revocation, 383.
Naples, Protestantism in, 334, 335.
Nationalism, rise and characteristics of, 26; exhibited by the Legists, 30; opposed to Boniface VIII., 30.
Navarre, Henry d'Albret, king of, 213.
Navarre, Anthony of, his opposition to the Guises, 223; his character and aims, 223; won over to the Catholics, 226; his death, 232.
Neander, on the Middle Ages, 8; on the origin of the Episcopate, 13; on the religious feeling of the German race, 73; on Zwingli, 125; on the origin and nature of Rationalism, 459.
Nemours, Duchess of, 236.
Nepotism of the Popes, 37.
Netherlands, sects in, before the Reformation, 47; thrift and intelligence of the, 245; relation to the German Empire (1518), 246; how Protestantism was introduced into the, 246; persecution under Charles V., 247; number of martyrs under Charles V., in the, 248; first complaints against Philip II., 250; the inquisition in the, 253; hatred of the Spaniards in the, 254; iconoclasm in the, 257; "Council of Blood," in the, 259; submission of the Catholic provinces to Phillip, 265; preponderance of the Calvinists in the, 266.

New England, cause of its settlement, 371.
Nicholas I., Pope, his power, 20.
Nicholas V., Pope, his grant to Alphonso, King of Portugal, 39.
Nicole, 381.
Nimeguen, Treaty of, 384.
Nominalism, its effect on scholasticism, 60.
Nördlingen, battle of, 364.
Norfolk, his rebellion, 324.
Norway, the Reformation in, 152.
Nostradamus, the astrologer, 3.
Nuremberg, Diet of (1522), presents one hundred complaints against the See of Rome, 101; Diet of (1524), remands the subject of the Worms decree to the several princes, 102; Peace of (1532), 137.

Occam, William of, maintains the cause of the civil authority, 34; his nominalism and skeptical philosophy, 34; his relation to Luther's doctrine of the Eucharist, 132.
Ochino, becomes a Protestant, 335; flies from Italy, 343; a professor at Oxford, 278; a Unitarian, 402.
Œcolampadius, his character, 125; on the doctrine of Servetus, 197.
Oldenburg, Count of, 150.
Old Testament, character of the religion of the, 12.
Olivetan, Peter, 168.
"Opposants," 382.
Oratory of Divine Love, its members and spirit, 332.
Orders, rise of the mendicant, 25; indicate a revival of religious zeal, 337;
Osiander, 275.
Otho I., the Holy Roman Empire, begins with him, 21.
Otho III., intervenes in the affairs of the Papacy, 21.
Otho IV., excommunicated by Innocent III., 25.
Oxenstiern, 363.

Palestrina, 350.
Palfrey, his history of New England, 372.
Pallavicini, on Leo X., 39.
Pantheism, its relation to Deism, 457.
Papacy, its relation to the sacerdotal order, 11; its growth favored by political circumstances, 17; its alliance with the Franks, 18; its relation to Charlemagne, 19; how affected by the divisions of his empire, 20; exalted by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, 20; period of Pornocracy in the, 21; intervention of Otho I., Otho III., and Henry III., in the affairs of the, 21; Hildebrand's idea of the, 21; its conflict with the Empire, 22; its advantages in this conflict, 22; aided in the conflict by divisions in Germany, 23; victory of the, 23; culmination of its power, 24; how affected by the rule of celibacy, 24; theory of the, advanced by Innocent III., 24; nature of its struggle with the Empire, 26; benefits of the, in the Middle Ages, 26; how treated by Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, 28; reaction against the, 30; decline of its prestige, 32; in the period of Babylonian captivity, 32; its aggressions upon Germany, England, and other countries, 32; the Great Schism, 32; Gallican theory of the, 35; spirit of the, in the fifteenth century, 37; secularizing of the, 41; character of the, in the Middle Ages, 42; its weakness under and after Louis XIV., 385.
Parkman, his work on the Jesuits in America, 462.
Parliament, the French, supports orthodoxy, 209, 211; the Scottish, confirms the establishment of Protestantism, 322.
Parma, Alexander of, in command in the Netherlands, 262; the Catholic provinces submit to him, 265; Philip's design to dismiss him, 265; his contest with Henry IV. in France, 241.
Paris, a seat of Catholic fanaticism, 232.
Paris, University of, condemns the "Colloquies" of Erasmus, 69.
Pascal, his "Provincial letters," 381, 442.
Passau, Treaty of, 146.
Patrick, Bishop, 376.
Paul, the Apostle, his Catholic interpretation of Christianity, 12.
Paul III., Pope, his belief in astrology, 2; encourages Francis I. to aid the Protestants, 41; allied with Francis I. against Charles V., 144; friendly to the Catholic reforming party, 335; his Commissions of Reform, 335; transfers the Council of Trent to Bologna, 340.
Paul IV., his administration, 349; his treatment of Elizabeth, 348; his relations to Queen Mary of England, 348.
Paulicians, 45.
Pavia, battle of, 102.
Pepin, his usurpation, 19; delivers the Papacy, 19.
Pepys, his diary, 374.

Perrin, Amy, 186; leads an insurrection, 202.
Peter, first mention of him as Bishop of Rome, 15.
Peter of Bruys, 47.
Petersen, Olaf, and Lawrence, preach the Reformation in Sweden, 153.
Petit, J., 425.
Petrarch, on the Papacy, 28; his relation to the revival of Learning, 58; on the corruption of the Papacy, 328.
Pfefferkorn, 64.
Philip the Fair, his contest with Boniface VIII., 31; on the usurpations of the clergy, 31; supported by his realm, 31.
Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, tries to unite the Lutherans and the Swiss, 132; restores the Duke of Würtemburg, 137; his double marriage, 137, 414; surrenders himself to Charles V., 143; released, 146.
Philip II., of Spain, his schemes cause alarm in France (1570), 235; his relations to the League in France, 241; his character, 248; an implacable enemy of religious dissent, 249; his unpopularity in the Netherlands, 249; appoints Margaret of Parma Regent, 250; leaves regiments in the Netherlands, 250; increases the number of bishoprics there, 251; revives the persecuting edicts of Charles V., 252; effect of his persecution in the Netherlands, 255; professes to mitigate the persecution, 256; his perfidy, 256; sends Alva to the Netherlands, 258; condemns all the people of the Netherlands as heretics, 259; will not grant toleration, 262; reply of William of Orange to his charges, 263; his design to dismiss Parma, 265; discomfiture of, 266; carries England into war with France, 281.
"Pierce the Ploughman's Crede," 28.
Piers' Ploughman, the vision of, 28.
Piotrkow, Diet of, 161.
Pisa, the Council of, 36.
Pius IV., his character, 348.
Pius V., his character and policy, 349; requests Alva to detroy Geneva, 258.
Pius IX., his Encyclical Letter, 437.
Plymouth, settlement at, 371; settled by Separatists, 371; their agreement with the Massachusetts settlers, 371.
Poggio, 193; his character, 331.
Poissy, Colloquy of, 229; Beza's appearance at, 229; result of the, 229.
Poland, its condition before the Reformation, 159; how Protestantism was introduced into, 160; its progress in, 160; dissension of Protestants in, 161.
Pole, Cardinal, how treated by the Catholic Reaction, 344; deprived of his legatine office, 282.
Politiques, rise of the Party of, 239.
Political Economy, rise of the science of, 451.
Polity, the Lutheran, its main features, 413; the reformed, 416.
Pomponatius, 456.
Popes, origin of their temporal kingdom, 20; their infallibility asserted, 25; their character in the fifteenth century, 37; their relation to the temporal power, 424.
Præmunire, statute of, passed, 33; revived by Henry VIII., 273.
Pragmatic Sanction, history of the, 40; repeal of the, 40.
Prague, University of, declares for the Utraquists, 155.
Prayer-Book of the Church of England, framed, 278.
Predestination, Calvin's doctrine of, 176; Zwingli's view of, 176; Calvin's view compared with Augustine's, 177; with Luther's, 177; in the Lutheran theology, 177; views of Anglican reformers on, 286; they are not rigid in the assertion of, 288; discussion of, among the Protestants, 397.
Presbyterianism, how far legalized in England, 370; established in Scotland, 376; its form in Geneva, 418; in France, 419; in Scotland, 419.
Presbyterians, how treated by Charles II., 373; their jealousy of State control, 419.
Prescott, on William of Orange, 264.
Prierias, Sylvester, writes against Luther, 83.
Priesthood, idea of, connected with the ministry, 13.
Professio Fidei (Tridentine), 341.
Protest at the Diet of Spires (1529), 103.
Protestantism, its positive element, 8; its objective side, 8; its source in the Scriptures, 8; a practical assertion of private judgment, 8; rejects Papal and priestly authority, 11; characterized, 44; spread of (from 1532), 137; from the Peace of Augsburg (1555), 147; why its progress was checked, 351; less acceptable in Southern Europe, 354; variations of its polity, 410; its spirit in the seventeenth century, 456; its struggle in the seventeenth century, 356; its influence on liberty, 432; its political

effect on Germany, 433; in England, 433; in America, 434; effect of the suppression of it on literature in Spain, 438; in Italy, 439; its relation to the fine arts, 454; spirit of progress in, 464; multiplying of sects under, 460; in Italy, circumstances favorable and unfavorable to, 327; forced to conceal itself, 332; a thing of degrees, 332; its spread, 333. See "Reformation," under the separate reformers, and under the different countries.
Protestant nations compared with Catholic, 430.
Protestants, origin of the name, 103; do not submit to the action of the Diet of Spires (1529), 104; their number in Spain, 346; their divisions aid the Catholic Reaction, 352; their doctrine of the Church, 391.
Provence, the bards of, 28.
"Provincial Letters," 381.
Provisors, statute of, 33.
Prussia, its rise, 385.
Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, character and effect of the, 20.
Puritan controversy, the merits of it, 297; Lord Bacon's judgment, 297.
Puritans, their origin and tenets, 291; their objections to the vestments, 292; their doctrines as expounded by Cartwright, 294; under James I., 366, 367; ejection of their ministers (1662), 373.

Rabelais, the spirit of his writings, 216.
Radbert, 129.
Raleigh, Sir Walter, 368, 448.
Ramus, Peter, 419.
Ranke, on Tycho Brahe and astrology, 3; on Leo X., 39; his criticism of Davila, 224; on the conspiracy of Amboise, 225; on the Orléans plot, 226; on the slaughter of St. Bartholomew, 237; on Henry IV. and the Huguenots, 243; on the "casket letters" and the murder of Darnley, 320; on Sarpi and Palavicini, 340; on the absence of the spirit of propagandism among Protestants, 353.
Rationalism, German, its two types, 458; in the Deistic form, 459; Pantheistic, 459.
Ratisbon, Catholic alliance formed at, 102; conference at, 138.
Ratramnus, denied transubstantiation, 129.
Reformation, long in preparation, 1; agency of individuals in the, 1; its origin and nature a subject of controversy, 2; astrological theory of the, 2; called by Leo X. a quarrel of monks 3; not merely a continuance of the strife of popes and emperors, 4; not merely a political event, 4; Guizot's view of, 4; an improvement of religion, 5; regarded by some as a step towards Rationalism, 5; a religious event, 7; its fundamental character, 7; a reaction of Christianity as Gospel against Christianity as law, 7; tends to intellectual liberty 8; not an isolated phenomenon, 9; age of the, characterized, 9; twofold aspect of the, 10; chronological limits of the, 10; Bellarmine, Adrian VI., and Erasmus, on the need of, 11; how it spread from Germany, 148; allies itself with democracy in the towns of the Hansa, 151; forerunners of the, how classified, 44; causes and omens of the, 45 seq.; various influences in the preparation of it, 71; could not come from Humanism, 115; its spread in Germany (1524), 102; its influence on science and literature, 438; complaints of Erasmus, 438; its effect on literature in England, 448; in Germany, 449; its effect on schools in England, 449; in Germany, 449; its benefit to Holland, 450; to Scotland, 450; political consequences of the, 432; its effect on religion, 455; its effect on philosophy, 451.
Reformers, Gallican, held to priestly authority, 48.
Reformers, radical, 49.
Reforms, efforts to effect, in the fifteenth century, 35.
Regency, German Council of, refuses to crush Lutheranism, 101.
Religion, its character in the Middle Ages, 43; how affected by the revival of learning, 58.
Renaissance, the tone of it in France, 216; skepticism of the Italian, 456. See "Revival of Learning."
Republic, the Dutch, rise of, 261; grows strong under Maurice, 266. See "Netherlands," "William of Orange," "Philip II."
Requesens, his policy, 261; successful in the South, 261; his death, 262; revolt of his soldiers, 262.
Reservation, the Ecclesiastical, 146; its effect, 147, 352; complaints of its violation, 358.
Restitution, Edict of, 361.
Restoration of Charles II., how effected, 372.
Reuchlin, his religious character, 63;

his contest with the monks, 63; condemned by the Sorbonne, 211.
Revival of Learning, spreads over Europe, 58; its consequences to religion, 58; produces the downfall of Scholasticism, 59; its effect on the study of the Scriptures, 61; its skeptical character in Italy, 61; its character in Germany, 63; in England, 65.
Revolution, French, gradually prepared, 1; predicted, 2.
Reynard the Fox, and the brute epic, 28.
Reynolds, Dr., at the Hampton Court Conference, 367.
Ricci, 462.
Richelieu, motive of his intervention in Germany, 363; gets the control of the war, 364; his internal policy, 378; his foreign policy, 379; his political testament, 379.
Richter, on the origin of the Episcopate, 13.
Ridley, on Predestination, 286; his martyrdom, 280.
Ritter, J. I., on the decline of the Papacy, 42; on Leo X., 39.
Rizzio, murder of, 315.
Robertson, J. B., 5.
Robinson, John, his principles, 296, 371.
Rochelle, its usefulness to the Huguenots, 233.
Rokyçana, 157.
Rome, city of, its preëminence, 15; sacked by the imperial troops, 103.
Rome, Empire of, effect of its fall on the Church, 18.
Rome, See of, grounds of its distinction, 16; foundation of its primacy in the East, 16; political ground of the primacy of, 14; growth of its power, 17; favored by Roman emperors, 17; servile relations of, to Justinian, 18; the bishop of, his primacy, 15; how built up, 15; view of Cyprian, 15. See "Papacy," and under the separate popes.
Romorantin, Edict of, 225.
Roscoe, on the character of Leo X., 39.
Rothe, on the organization of the primitive Church, 13.
Rouen, captured and sacked by the Catholics, 232.
Roussel, G., takes refuge with Briçonnet, 211.
Rudolph II., his fanaticism, 357.
Rudolph of Hapsburg, his submission to the Papacy, 24.
Ryswick, Peace of, 384.

Sacraments, Luther's discussion of the, 87.
Sadolet, Calvin's letter to, 189.
Saint André, one of the Triumvirate, 228.
Sainte Beuve, on infidelity in France under Louis XIV., 457.
Sarpi, Father Paul, on Leo X., 39.
Savonarola, his career, 53; works on, 53.
Savoy, Dukes of, Vidames of Geneva, 182.
Savoy Conference, 373.
Scandinavian kingdoms, their union, 148; power of the prelates in, 148.
Schism, the Great Papal, 34.
Schleiermacher, character of his influence, 459.
Schmidt, on the Caltharists, 45.
Scholasticism, its uses, 59; causes of its downfall, 59, 60.
Schurff, Jerome, 96.
Schwab, on Boniface VIII., 30.
Scotland, its condition at the Reformation, 300; roughness of the nobles, 299; wealth and profligacy of its clergy, 300; covetousness of the nobles, 300; need of Reformation in, 300; attempts at reform in, 300; martyrs in, 300; Reformation legalized in, 303; delivered from danger from the Guises, 304; League and Covenant formed in (1638), 369; under Charles II., and James II., 376; benefit of the Reformation to, 450; Reformation in, connected with that of England, 299; Reformation in, not preceded by the revival of letters, 300; marked by hatred of the Papacy, 300; established by law, 303. See "Knox," "Mary, Queen of Scots," "Protestantism."
Scroggs, Judge, 445.
Sects, rise of anti-sacerdotal, 45; works on them, 45; anti-sacerdotal, what they indicate, 47; multiplication of, 460; analogous divisions in the Catholic Church, 461; bad effect of, 461.
Selden, 369.
Semler, relation of Rationalism to, 458, 460.
Sendomir, Synod of, 162.
Servetus, influence of his death favorable to toleration, 195; his early history and studies, 197; publishes his book on the Trinity, 197; as a naturalist and physician, 198; at Vienne, 198; publishes his "Restoration of Christianity," 198; his doctrine, 198; arraigned for heresy before a Roman Catholic tribunal, 198; evidence against him from Geneva, 198; escapes and comes to Geneva, 199; is tried, convicted, and burned at the stake, 200;

Guizot's judgment of, 201; the execution of generally approved, 202. See "Calvin."
Seville, Protestantism in, 346.
Sigismund I., King of Poland, 160.
Sigismund II., King of Poland, friendly to Protestantism, 161.
Silvester, Pope, 29.
Sismondi, on Italy in the fifteenth century, 327.
Sixtus IV., Pope, his character and aims, 37; his doctrine respecting the deliverance of souls from purgatory, 80.
Sixtus V., his Index expurgatorius, 344.
Skepticism, of the Renaissance in Italy, 456; origin of modern, 456; in France 457; in the reign of Louis XIV., 386.
Smalcald, League of, formed, 136; admission of the four cities to, 136.
Smalcaldic War, 143.
Smith, Mrs. H. B., 180.
Socinianism, its principles, 404.
Socinus, Faustus, his history, 402; his influence in Poland, 161.
Socinus, Lælius, 402; why treated with forbearance by Calvin, 201.
Somerset, 278; his invasion of Scotland, 279; suppresses a Catholic rebellion, 279; brought to the scaffold, 279.
Sorbonne, hostile to innovations in doctrine, 209, 211; hostile to Reuchlin, 211; it puts forth a creed, 218;
Spain, monarchy, in the fifteenth century, in, 36; fanatical spirit of the monarchy in, 248; the inquisition in, 249; attacked on the seas by the Dutch, 266; its desultory conflict with England, 325; literary spirit in, 344; Protestant influences upon, 345; character of Protestantism in, 346; Protestantism eradicated in, 347. See "Literature."
Spinola, his efforts for the reunion of churches, 407.
Spires, Diet at (1526), 103; in 1529, 103.
Spirituals, or Fratricelli, their character, 47.
Spottiswoode, on the abduction of Mary, 318.
St. Aldegonde, 255; discusses toleration with William of Orange, 268.
State, its power in relation to the Church statement of the Augsburg confession, 412; of Luther, 412; of Melancthon, 412; in Germany, 415; Zwingli's view, 416; See "Church and State."
States General of France, their meeting at Orléans, 225.
Staupitz, his counsels to Luther, 77.
St. Bartholomew, massacre of, was it premeditated, 237.
St. Cyran, 381.
St. Germain, edict of (1562), 229; Treaty of (1570), 234.
Stillingfleet, 376.
Strauss, D. F., 459.
Stunica, his charges of heresy against Erasmus, 69.
St. Victor, School of, 54.
Sunday, theory of the Reformers on its observance, 406.
Supremacy, act of, under Henry VIII., 274.
Supremacy, the King's, meaning attached to it at first, 274; indirectly assailed by the Puritans, 294.
Sutri, Synod of, 21.
Sweden, first preaching of Protestantism in, 153; adopts the Reformation, 153; conduct of its soldiers in Germany, 360; efforts of Jesuits in, 351; how affected by the treaty of Westphalia, 365; decline of its power, 385.
Switzerland, its condition in the fifteenth century, 119; how demoralized, 119; influence of literary culture in, 120; the Reformation in, both political and religious, 125; catastrophe of the Reformation in, 134.

Taborites, their tenets, 155.
Tacitus, on the religion of the Germans, 72.
Taine, on the character of the Germans, 72; on the religious feeling of Elizabethan writers, 448.
Tasso, 349, 440.
Tauler, John, his character, 54; is studied by Luther, 55.
"Territorial system," 416.
Tertullian, against persecution, 194.
Tetzel, his sale of indulgences, 79; his counter-theses, 83.
Theatins, their origin, 337.
Theology, Lutheran, peculiarities of, 404.
Theology, the Protestant, its essential principles, 387; its denial of human merit, 388; makes the Bible the rule of faith, 389; its doctrine of the Church, 391; its doctrine of a universal priesthood, 395; its opposition to the Mass, penances, etc., 396; to invocation of Mary and the Saints, the worship of images and relics, pilgrimages, etc., 396; its qualitative conception of character, 396.
Theology, Roman Catholic, its doctrine of justification, 390; its doctrine of the Church, 392; its doctrine of the

Sacraments, 393; its modification after the Reformation, 392; its doctrine of the priesthood, 393.
Theses, Luther posts his, 79; commotion excited by them, 82; give joy to Reuchlin, 83; opposed by Prierias, Tetzel, and Eck, 83.
Thirty Years' War, main cause of its miseries, 360; how ended, 364; its effect on Germany, 364.
Ticknor, on the decline of Spanish literature, 438.
Tillotson, 376.
Tilly, his victories, 360.
Toleration, Act of, 376.
Torgau, League of, 102.
Torquemada, 342.
Tosti, his life of Boniface VIII., 30.
Toulouse, Albigenses in, 46.
Tournon, Cardinal de, 217.
Traheron, Bartholomew, on Calvinism in England, 288; on the Eucharistic question in England, 290.
Transubstantiation, the doctrine of, when adopted in the Church, 129; made an article of faith, 129; denied by Luther, 87; denied by all the Reformers, 129.
Trent, Council of, begins with condemning the Protestant doctrine, 144.
Trie, Guillaume, 198.
Trinity, agreement of Catholics and Protestants on the doctrine of the, 387.
Triumvirate, its formation in France, 228.
Tulloch, on the Anglican Calvinists, 289.
Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, 275.
Turks, the, dangerous to Europe, 94; they hinder Charles V. from attacking the Protestants, 137.
Tycho Brahe, his faith in astrology, 3.
Tyndale, his martyrdom, 271; Frith, his martyrdom, 271.

Ullmann, on the nature of the Reformation, 7.
Uniformity, Act of, 282.
Unigenitus, the Bull, 382; its effect on the French clergy, 385.
Union of Catholics and Protestants, efforts to procure it, 405; efforts of Grotius, 406.
Union, of Calvinists and Lutherans, efforts to procure it, 405.
Union, Evangelical, in Germany, 358.
Union, the Utrecht, 263.
Unitarians, in Poland, 161; in Transylvania, 165. See "Socinus, Faustus."
Universities, strongholds of Scholasticism, 64; Humanists admitted to some of them, 64; influence of the Jesuits in, 350.
Urban VI., Pope, 34.
Urban VIII., 441.
Usher, Archbishop, 369; a Calvinist, 289.
Utraquists, origin of the, 154; they go beyond Huss, 155; not subdued, by crusades, 157; are heard at the Council of Basel, 157; concessions to them, 157; division of the, 155; war between the two parties of, 158; refuse to join Ferdinand I. in the Smalcaldic War, 159.
Utrecht, Peace of, 384.
Uytenbogaert, 398.

Valdez, Juan, 334.
Valentinian III., gives supremacy in the Church to Leo I., 18.
Valla, Laurentius, exposes the fiction of Constantine's donation, 330.
Van Male, 249.
Vasa, Gustavus, establishes Protestantism in Sweden, 153.
Vassy, massacre of, 230; rouses the indignation of the Huguenots, 231.
Vergerio, flies from Italy, 343.
Venice, Protestantism in, 334, 335.
Vervins, Treaty of, 243.
Vestments, controversy on, 291; opinion of Jewel and other bishops on the use of them, 292; opinion of Burleigh and other statesmen, 292; advice of the Swiss Reformers, 293; statements of Macaulay, 292.
Villabra, 347.
Villari, on Savonarola, 53.
Vilmar, on the reception of Christianity by the Germans, 72.
Vinet, on Calvin, 206.
Visitation, the Saxon, 413.
Voltaire, 385; refers the Reformation to a dispute of monks, 3; Erasmus compared with, 66; on Pascal's "Provincial Letters," 442.

Waddington, on Luther and the Peasants' War, 117.
Waldenses, their origin and tenets, 46; works on the, 47; massacre of, in Calabria, 343.
Waldo, Peter, 46.
Wallenstein, his faith in astrology, 3; his character, 360; victories of, 360; removed from command, 361; recalled, 362; put to death, and why, 364.
Walter, on the origin of the Episcopate, 13.

War, the Peasants', 116; connection of Lutheranism with, 116; the Reformation not responsible for, 118.
Warburton, on Church and State, 421.
War of Cappel, effect of it, 181.
Wars, civil in France, the beginning of, 231.
Wartburg, Luther's residence at the, 98.
Wesley, John, his theology, 400.
Wessel, John, his opinions, 52; Luther on, 52.
Westeras, Diet of, 153.
Westminster Assembly, how composed, 369; its work, 370.
Westphalia, Peace of, 365.
Whitgift, on Episcopacy, 285; a strenuous Calvinist, 289; contrasted with Hooker, 289.
Wickliffe, his tenets, 49; works on, 49; how protected, 50; a realist, 60.
Wickliffites, when first persecuted, 50.
William of Nogaret, he assaults Boniface VIII., 31.
William of Orange, his early history, 250; his motives, 252; quells disturbances in Antwerp, 257; leaves the country, 258; his efforts to deliver his country, 259, 261; insists on toleration, 268; his help asked by Flanders and Brabant, 262; rejects the offers of Don John, 262; reward offered for his life, 263; his "Apology," 263; his sincerity, 264; his prudence, 264; his assassination, 265; his code of ecclesiastical laws, 269; demands religious liberty, 268.
William III., his defense of Holland, 384; acknowledged as King of England, by Louis XIV., 384.
Williams, Roger, 372; his principles, 427.
Wiseman, on Boniface VIII., 30.
Wittenberg, University of, founded, 64; fosters Humanism, 64; Luther a Professor at, 77.
Wolmar, Melchior, teaches Calvin Greek, 168.
Wolsey, Cardinal, favors learning, 270; his fall, 273.
Worcester House Declaration of Charles II., 372.
Worms Concordat, 24.
Worms, Diet of, 95; its decree against Luther, 97.
Worship, order of, in the Protestant churches, 420.
Wullenweber, 151; his death, 152.
Würtemberg, Duke of, reëstablished in his possessions, 137.
Wyat, his insurrection, 279.
Wyttenbach, Thomas, his reformatory tendencies, 120.

Xavier, St. Francis, 338, 462.
Ximenes, Cardinal, his "Polyglot," 345.

Yuste, Charles V., at the convent of, 249.

Zacharias, Pope, sanctions the usurpation of Pepin, 19.
Zépolya, John of, 164.
Ziska, leader of the Taborites, 156.
Zurich, public disputation at (1523), 123; adopts the Reformation, 124; spread of the Reformation from, 125. See "Zwingli."
Zwingli, his birth and parentage, 120; studies at Basel, Berne, and Vienna, 120; pastor at Glarus, 120; opposes the pension-system, 121; at the battle of Marignano, 121; pastor at Einsiedeln, 121; preaches against the sale of indulgences, 122; removes to Zurich, 122; his power as a preacher, 122; his personal characteristics, 123; holds a public disputation (1523), 123; another disputation, 124; his "Commentary" etc., 124; his theological tenets, 124; political element in his Reformation, 125; contrasted with Luther, 126; his patriotism, 127; broke with the Papacy after Luther, 128; letter to him from Adrian VI., 128; his pleasantry, 123; his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 130; on the doctrine of Servetus, 197; on Church and State, 416; at the Conference at Marburg, 132; recommends to the Protestant cantons bold measures, 135; his death, 136.

BOOKS BY GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D.
Emeritus Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University
PUBLISHED BY CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

History of the Christian Church

With Maps. 8vo, $3.50

"I am glad to be allowed to say here how highly I appreciate its value. It is a most difficult thing most excellently done, and its usefulness must be very great."—*Phillips Brooks.*

"I am surprised that the author has been able to put such multitudes of facts with analysis of opinions, definitions of tendencies, and concise personal sketches into a narrative at once so graceful, graphic, and compact."—*Rev. R. S. Storrs, D.D.*

"It is the only manual of church history we have ever seen that may be called readable ; it is a really interesting book ; it is accurate, comprehensive, and candid."—New York *Examiner.*

"Probably the best compendium on the subject, within moderate limits, to be found in the English language. . . . Clear, impressive, scholarly, and impartial."—New York *Sun.*

The Reformation

Crown 8vo, $2.50 net

"Professor Fisher's history presents the result of prolonged, extended, and exact study, with those excellent qualities of style which are so characteristic of him—clearness, smoothness, judicial fairness, vividness, felicity in arranging materials, as well as in grouping and delineating characters."
—*Prof. Charles A. Aiken, D.D., Princeton Theological Seminary.*

"A production which may be welcomed with just pride, as an honor to American letters, for its solidity, completeness, and admirable spirit. . . . Every intelligent student of modern history will gratefully appreciate the learning and acuteness, accuracy and candor which are brought by the author to the elucidation of the subject."—New York *Tribune.*

BOOKS BY GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D.

The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief

8vo, $2.50

"Take it all in all, for a complete work on evidences, including and presenting in their best light all the historical and current arguments, we are prepared to accept this as the practically satisfactory and sufficient work."—*The Churchman.*

"The author treats an old and difficult theme in the light of the freshest developments of religious thought. . . . By this masterly work he has laid the friends of Christian truth under lasting obligations."—New York *Tribune.*

History of Christian Doctrine

INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

Crown 8vo, $2.50 net

"It is a marvel to me how a book of this kind can be written so accurately to scale. It could only be done by one who had a very complete command of all the periods."

—*Prof. William Sanday, of Oxford University.*

"It is of the class of works that mark epochs in their several departments."—*The Outlook.*

The Unpublished Essay of Jonathan Edwards on the Trinity

With an Introduction on his Characteristics and his Theology

12mo, $1.25 net

"He who would clearly discriminate between pantheism and his own conviction of the immanence of God should first of all drink deep of Edwards—having first read this penetrating and most attractive essay by Dr. Fisher."—*Christian Work and Evangelist.*

BOOKS BY GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D.

The Nature and Method of Revelation

12mo, $1.25

"Thoroughly modern both in scholarship and philosophy, and written by one who is an expert in biblical criticism and as candid as he is scholarly."—*The Outlook.*

The Beginnings of Christianity

With a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ

Crown 8vo, $2.50

"The volume is not a dry repetition of well-known facts. It bears the marks of original research. Every page glows with freshness of material and choiceness of diction."—*The Examiner.*

Supernatural Origin of Christianity

With Special Reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tübingen School

Crown 8vo, $2.50

"Able and scholarly essays on the supernatural origin of Christianity, in which Professor Fisher discusses such subjects as the genuineness of the Gospel of John, Baur's view of early Christian history and literature, and the mythical theory of Strauss."
—*The North American Review.*

Discussions in History and Theology

8vo, $3.00

"Professor Fisher has gathered here a number of essays on subjects connected with those departments of study and research which have engaged his special attention, and in which he has made himself an authority."

BOOKS BY GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D.

Manual of Christian Evidences

12mo, 75 cents

"It is worth its weight in gold. It is by all odds the best treatise on the evidences of Christianity for general use that we know. It is sound, judicious, clear, and scholarly."

—*The Examiner.*

Manual of Natural Theology

12mo, 75 cents

"It is literally *multum in parvo*. It is a good pocketbook for the old student and a good text-book for the young."

—*Bishop John H. Vincent.*

The Christian Religion

12mo, 50 cents net

"We know not where else is to be found within the same compass so able and perspicuous a setting forth and interblended defence of this great theme."—*Christian Work and Evangelist.*

Faith and Rationalism

With Short Supplementary Essays on Related Topics

12mo, 75 cents

"This little volume may be regarded as virtually a primer of modern religious thought, which contains within its condensed pages rich materials that are not easily gathered from the great volumes of our theological authors. Alike in learning, style, and power of discrimination, it is honorable to the author and to his university, which does not urge the claims of science by slighting the worth of faith or philosophy."—New York *Times.*

The Colonial Era

AMERICAN HISTORY SERIES

With 3 Maps. 12mo, $1.00 net

"The work is characterized by that peculiar quality of interest which is found in all Professor Fisher's historical writing, and which arises from his thorough competency."—*The Outlook.*

Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LD-URL
LD URL MAR 8 1971
MAR 8 1971
REC'D LD-URL
LD URL MAY 29 1972
JUN 7 1972
REC'D LD-URL
LD URL APR 6 1976
APR 16 1976
AUG 9 1986
AUG 9 1986
REC'D LD-URL
RENEWAL
LD URL SEP 04 1986
SEP 09 19

Form L9–Series 444

A.M. 7|8|9|10|11|12|1|2|3|4|5|6 P.M.

UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA
AT
LOS ANGELES
LIBRARY

3 1158 00288 5100

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 001 098 678 4